PROTESTANTISM in the UNITED STATES

School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1377489

ARCHER B. BASS

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PROTESTANTISM IN THE UNITED STATES

BR
515
B45

PROTESTANTISM IN THE UNITED STATES

BY

ARCHER B. BASS, A.M., TH.D.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY

PUBLISHERS NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1929,
BY THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY T. MOREY & SON

TO

JESSIE LEGG BASS

PREFACE

This book registers the profound conviction of its author that a closer Interdenominational Co-operation is the characteristic phase of present-day Protestantism in the United States, and supplies the foundation on which rests the hope of its future success. All his ministerial experience—two and one-half years as pastor in a town of fifteen hundred people with four Protestant churches, one year as chaplain with the A. E. F., when men worshiped together without knowing or asking questions about one's denominational affiliations, seven years as pastor of an important church in a city of one-half million population, and then two years as pastor of a dominating church in a town of three thousand people which held three other Protestant churches—has only served to strengthen that conviction. If the book helps to lead its readers to a like conviction the writer will be glad.

In recent years, especially within the last dozen, which covers the time the material for this work was being collected, much has been written on different phases of the co-operative movement among the Protestant denominations; but, in so far as the writer is aware, there is no single volume which covers the entire field with a reasonable measure of fullness. That is what this work seeks to do. Wherefore, it limits its

discussion of Interdenominationalism to its manifestations among the denominations in the United States. Every effort has been made to give due acknowledgment to all works directly quoted.

ARCHER B. BASS.

Mansfield College,
Oxford, England.
January, 1929.

CONTENTS

PART I

DENOMINATIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES: ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER PAGE

I. The European Background 3

Seeds of the Reformation—Rise of the Reformation—Break-Up of European Protestantism into Sects—Sectarian Spirit Manifested by Creed-Making—Sectarian Spirit Seen in Certain Statements and Occurrences—Sectarian Spirit Deepened by Suffering.

II. Rise of Protestant Denominations in the United States 20

Those "Imported" to Colonial America—Those "Imported" 1789–1849—Those "Imported" 1850–1899—Those "Imported" 1900–Present—Beginning of Native Sects in Colonial America—Native Sects Born 1789 to Present—European Influence on Native Sects—Frontier Influence and Native Sects—Politico-Religious Theories—Philosophical Individualism.

III. Why Protestants Separated 36

Nature and Function of the Lord's Supper—The Function, Subject, and Mode of Baptism—Five Points of Calvinism—Arminianism—Adherence to the Seventh Day—The Second Coming and Immortality—Questions of Church Membership—Forms and Functions of Church Government—Variations from Types of Polity—Progressivism Versus Conservatism—Religious Revivals—Spiritual

CHAPTER PAGE

Versus Formal Christianity—The Search for Unity —Different Interpretations of the Bible—The Institution of Slavery—The Factor of Personal Influence—Two Indigenous Sects—Cessation from Division.

IV. The Good in Separation 67

Exaltation of the Bible—Religious Liberty—Mutual Denominational Respect—Stimulated Christian Education—Immigrant Education—The Appeal to the Masses—Distinctive Separateness—A Healthful Rivalry—Notable Achievements.

V. The Evils in Separation 84

Loss of Spiritual Fellowship—Surplus of Church Edifices—Consequent Financial Burden—Indiscriminate Locating of Churches—Over-Supply of Ministers—The Ministers' Salaries—Poorly Trained Ministry—Problem of Resident Ministry —Church Quarters—Church Program—Proposed Remedies—Interdenominational Co-operation the Cure.

PART II

INTERDENOMINATIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES: ITS PROBLEM AND PROGRESS

VI. Co-operation and the Distribution of Denominations among the States . . 111

Sects per State—Area Covered by Denominations —No State Has Full Gospel—Relative Influence of Denominations—Small Sects Grow as Well as Large—States Showing Preference for Certain Sects—Influence on Co-operation—A Questionnaire—One-half of Protestants in Ten Per Cent of Sects.

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. Co-operation and Home Missions . . . 135

Home Mission Boards and Their Work—Aid to Competing Churches—Degree of Competition—Who Receives the Aid?—Home Missions Council—Important Achievements of Home Mission Council—Comity Principles—State Councils' Work—Presbyterians (North and South)—Town and Country Churches—Encouraging Procedure—Do Home Mission Boards Officials Approve?

VIII. Co-operation and the "United" Churches . 166

The United Churches—Their Origin and Growth—The Various Types—Pepperell and Latitudinarian Types—Federated Type—Undenominational Type—Denominational Type—Affiliated Type—Merits of These Churches—Solving the Town and Country Problem—They Do Better Work—Their Support of Missions—Enlarged Local Program—The Movement in the South—What Their Pastors Say—Benefits of Ecclesiastical Connection.

IX. Co-operation and Foreign Missions . . 196

The Task Too Great for Any One Sect—Proportionate Share of Workers—Unification for Increased Power—Viewed from Mission Lands—Native Christians' Demand—Attitude of Missionaries—Some Notable Achievements—The Field of Education—Economic Advantages—Reaction at the Home Base—Conference of Foreign Mission Boards—Women's Board of Foreign Missions—International Missionary Councils—Attitude of Board Officials—The Future for Co-operation.

X. Additional Movements toward Co-operation 221

Some Instances of Union in Family Groups—Some Proposals for Corporate or Organic Union Between Varying Denominations—Administrative and Federal Union—Movements of an Undenominational Character.

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. Training for Co-operation 260

Impossible to Check—Unconscious Preparation—By Marriage—Various Civic Organizations—Place of the Radio—Necessity for Special Propaganda—To Overcome Past Training—To Offset Appeal of Sectarian Pride—Emphasis on Points of Likeness—Inescapable Similarities—Need for Religious Leaders of Wide Sympathies—What Seminaries Are Doing—Undenominational Seminaries—A Questionnaire—Replies of Note—Leaders in Training for Co-operation—The Need for Such Training—A Prayer.

Appendix A 297

Denominations Brought Here—Denominations That Arose in This Country.

Appendix B 319

Negro Denominations.

Bibliography 323

Addenda 327

Index 345

PART I

DENOMINATIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES: ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I

THE EUROPEAN BACKGROUND

The white Protestants living to-day in the United States are grouped in one hundred and fifty-three denominations. But as a tree's manifold branches hold a vital relation to the tree's equally manifold rootage, so this branching of American Protestantism sustains a vital relation to its equally manifold European rootage. That it was "by a prodigy of divine providence" the North American Continent was not settled until there were European Protestants with whom to settle it, and therefore this marked a "high strategy, in the warfare for the advancement of the kingdom of God in the earth", as one church historian affirms, may be a conclusion of a manifest religious bias.[1] However, neither the presence nor absence of any particular religious viewpoint can alter these facts: all Roman Catholic settlements in North America prior to and including those of the sixteenth century ultimately fell into dismal ruin and were, therefore, of no permanent influence; while between the real discovery of America in 1492 and the early seventeenth century settlements which permanently survived, Europe passed thru a religious upheaval which left the larger part of America's ancestral section of it permanently Protestant.

[1] L. W. Bacon, *History of American Christianity*, page 2.

Seeds of the Reformation

To be sure this sixteenth century European religious upheaval was a fruitage from seeds long germinating in genuine Roman Catholic soil, and had required centuries to grow into a ripened harvest. For instance, the Revival of Learning, which, originating as a renewed study of Greek and Roman antiquity but continuing as a study of man in general, expressed in his language, art, politics, and religion, gave rise to universities, helped to dethrone scholasticism and to enthrone humanism, to displace an authoritative ecclesiasticism and its bondage of hierarchical control with an experiential religion growing into a love of human freedom from the study of a newly translated Bible, must be counted as one of these seeds. Those slowly rising economic forces, which displaced the lords and lands, vassals and subinfeudation, serfs and slaves of feudalism with a social order comprising labor guilds with their ruling democratic councils; wealthy burghers and merchants in a hundred newly established growing towns and cities; an economically independent citizenry (many of whom had been raised from virtual slavery); a church deprived of some of its wealth so long vested in landed holdings whence grew its luxury, simony, and unjust oppression, must be regarded as some others. Then, from the middle of the fourteenth century intrepid explorers, guided by Flavio Giorga's mariner's compass, widened the bounds of geographical knowledge until, by 1522 when Magellan completed his circumnavigation of the globe, it embraced the western coast of Africa, much of North and South Amer-

ica and the Far East; while equally courageous astronomers led by Copernicus coincidentally had extended man's knowledge of the universe to include the true solar system, and these discoveries, compelling men to change their views of the universe in which they lived, and helping to prepare them to be willing to change their notions of their relationship to God and of God's relationship to them, were still some others. The rising New Nationalism, which, constantly pitting itself in varying degrees against the domineering papal power in different countries, by the sixteenth century had enabled France to withstand the demands of Boniface VIII, to make Pope Clement V largely the tool of the French Monarchy, Avignon the site of the Babylonian Captivity, and the nation to be the home of a defiant Gallican church; had helped Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain to put down the internal disunion of Castile and Aragon, thereby bending the nobles and the church to the royal wills; had created in Germany and Austria such a sense of national solidarity that by the time of Charles V the pope was forced into a position of neutrality respecting middle Europe and France; had given rise in England to the statute of mortmain, wrung from John the Magna Charta, and aided Edward III and Parliament to restrict papal appointments to English livings; and even in Italy by its potent rumblings had caused the pope's influence to wane to some extent, was yet another. The labors of certain pivotal characters such as Marcellus of Padua, who taught that the church's supreme authority belonged not to any order of clergy, but to the whole body of Christian believers—clergy and

laymen alike; Wyclif, who championed the cause of state against the papal claims and made the Scriptures the church's only valid decree and Christ its only true head; Nicolas of Clemanges, rector of the University of Paris, who made the Scripture the only source of saving faith; Jacob of Joeterbook, who denounced the greedy misuse of the sale of indulgences and insisted that the pope be subordinated to general Councils; Huss, who supported the king and preached doctrines of grace and faith; Savonarola and John Wessel, who were evangelistic preachers before Evangelicism was born, combined, make yet another. But in the very head and heart of the church, the Hierarchy—in terms of bitter contests over papal and conciliar authority, immoral popes, incorrigible clergy, and a merciless vengeance reaching out its bloody hands in persecution of numerous lovers of purity, truth and spiritual religion—was rooted the final seed-factor, which, growing to maturity, was destined to force a religious change. Yet, tho it be acknowledged that the soil in which these seeds had germinated and for so long had flourished was genuinely Roman Catholic, when the time of ripened fruit—consisting of new world views, new political ideas, new demands in education, new economic means, and a new interpretation of the Christian religion—came, another soil, that of Protestantism, was required in which this newer harvest could grow; and that was formed in those countries of northern Europe, which subsequently became the ancestral homes of the early permanent settlers in North America, within the comparatively short historical period of a century and a half (1517–1648).

Rise of the Reformation

When in their relationship to the Protestant Reformation all the countries of Europe are considered, they should be divided into the three following groups: (1) those in which, if introduced, Protestantism suffered defeat; (2) those in which it enjoyed a temporary and partial success; and (3) those in which it was triumphant.

Of group one, in the case of Spain, altho the reform movement was introduced early by court officials who attended Charles V to Germany and returned with evangelical convictions; a Spanish New Testament was published in 1543; and Protestants became numerous in some sections, as, for instance, Seville and Valladolid, nevertheless, due to the severe persecutions under Philip II and the rise of the Inquisition, Protestantism was extirpated by the end of the century. In Italy, where the Duchess of Ferrara, a sister-in-law of Francis I, supported it; where a little book of reform teachings, "The Benefit of Christ's Death", enjoyed a wide circulation; where some influential individuals like Bernadino Ochino, Peter Paul Vergerius and Galeazzo Carriccioli were its converts and advocates, Protestantism seemed for a time to gain headway; but in the final count only a few Waldensians in the Piedmont section remained—and they despite the severest persecutions.

Of group two, in the case of France, Protestantism gained a sufficiently strong foothold at the outset—thanks to Jacques Le Fevre and his co-laborers with their vernacular Bible completed in 1535—to survive the

persecutions under Francis I (1535 on) and Henry II, so that by 1559 a Confession of Faith was drawn up by the General Assembly: but a little while after this triumph, when the Protestants became a political party, and the consequent period (1562–1585) of eight religious wars (including St. Bartholomew's Massacre with its seventy thousand martyrs), was over; even their growth under the Edicts of Nantes (1589) and Nismes (1629) was not sufficient to give them a dominant position, and with the revocation of these Edicts in 1685, Protestantism became illegal in every form. In Bohemia and Moravia, while it was the Toleration Edict of Joseph II in 1781 which ultimately set the Protestants free from persecutions, the reform spirit, since the organization of the Unitas Fratrum in 1455 had been present in such power that a Protestant Confession of Faith was proposed in 1511, and a bit later Luther's teachings were greeted by the people with acclaim. Moreover, tho the penal statutes of King Ferdinand, issued against them because they refused to fight the Lutherans in the Schmalcald war, drove out the Protestants, they returned in 1574 under the friendly rule of Maximilian II, and by 1606 had wrung from Rudolph II a rescript which gave them temporary religious liberty. In Poland the Reformation was introduced by exiled Bohemian Brethren, and tho it received a severe setback under Sigismund I (1506–1548), it subsequently enjoyed a long period of prosperity during the reign of Sigismund Augustus (1548–1632). In Hungary the reform movement was introduced by students from Wittenberg; a vernacular New Testament was printed in 1541; and the many adherents were able

to force from Rudolph II complete religious liberty in the Vienna Peace of 1606.

But in the case of the countries belonging to group three, there is a different story to tell of the progress of the Reformation. For instance, despite the fickle fortunes of political contenders with their home and foreign wars; the fanatical zeal of the Zwickau prophets which placed it in a most unfavorable light in the eyes of many; and the Peasants' War, the Reformation, thru the activities of the Diet of Spires, and the Leagues of Targan, Cognac, and Schmalcald, swept over Germany with such rapidity that by 1648 Protestantism was established never to be dislodged. Then, led by Zwingli, and carried on by his successors, Protestantism ruled in Zurich by 1520, in Basel by 1525, in Geneva by 1536; and its theories passed unrestricted in Muhlhausen by 1524, in Biel and Berne by 1528; while by 1550 all of Switzerland, save the Five Forest Cantonments, was protestantized. In Scandinavia, thanks to the labors of Christian II and especially of Christian III, Denmark was officially declared Protestant by 1526; Norway after a period of Catholic reaction was claimed for Protestantism by the same date; and tho, after the Reformation was forced upon Sweden in 1537 by the Diet of Westeras, there came a long period of reaction under Catholic rulers from 1568 to 1600, yet Protestantism was finally established for good by Gustavus Adolphus, 1611–1632. In the Netherlands territory, comprising practically what is now the area of Belgium and Holland, the reform movement was early introduced, and tho violently opposed by Philip II and so mercilessly

persecuted by the Duke of Ava, whom Philip called to his assistance, that eighteen thousand Protestants were executed in six years time: yet when some northern provinces formed the Union of Utrecht in 1579, and declared their independence of Spain three years later, that step so well established the Reformation that the Stadtholder, William of Orange, his son Maurice and others were able, with the assistance of England, to make Holland a free Republic in which a Protestant state church flourished by 1648. In Scotland, tho its Parliament in 1526 forbade the importation of Luther's works; the reform movement was opposed during the Regency of James' widow, 1542–1560; and Roman Catholicism under the rule of Mary and her Dauphin husband was greatly encouraged; yet thru the preaching of Patrick Hamilton and those of like views, the secret circulation of Tyndale's translated Bible, and the work of John Knox, Protestantism got such a hold that by 1559 Parliament commissioned Knox to draw up a Confession of Faith which it adopted August 17th, 1560; a National Covenant was drawn up in 1581; and by 1592 Protestantism was incorporated in an established church. In England the rather fortuitous and dubious circumstance of Henry VIII's demand for a divorce gave the Reformation an early impetus; but in the life of the people it really sprang from a wide reading of Tyndale's Bible and the humanistic teachings of Colet and More, from which it got such a hold that by the reign of Edward VI (1547–1553) all laws against the Protestants could be abrogated; the Book of Common Prayer could be established; and by 1553 no Catholic reaction, even

that of Mary's reign (1553–1558), could stem the tide of its onward rush thru Elizabeth's reign (1558–1603), James I's rule (1603–1625), and on to its final successful establishment at the end of the Cromwellian period in 1660. And it was from the countries of this latter group the larger part of the early permanent settlers on the North American continent came.

Break-up of European Protestantism into Sects

In this connection it is well to consider also the break-up of European Protestantism into its numerous European denominations. Nothing was left of it in Spain by 1600 except the memory of its former presence, and in Italy only the Waldensians; in every other country, even in those where it was weakest, the Reformation left surviving Protestant groups. The Reformed Huguenots were in France; Unitas Fratrum or United Brethren, Taborites, Calvinists, Lutherans, Calixtines and Anabaptists were in Bohemia and Moravia; Lutherans, Calvinists or Reformed, and Anabaptists were in Hungary; Lutherans, Reformed, Waldensians, Brethren, Anti-Trinitarians and Anabaptists were in Poland; Lutherans, Calvinistic Reformed, Zwinglian Reformed, Anabaptists, Schwenkfelders, and by 1735, United Brethren, were in Germany; Lutherans, Reformed, Anabaptists, Socinians, Mennonites, and Arminians were in Holland; Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Congregationalists, General and Particular Baptists, Quakers, and by 1784, Methodists, flourished in the British Isles; and altho in Scandinavia Protestantism was embraced within the Lutheran Creed, still the geo-

graphical boundaries, which set off the racial cleavages of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, also marked very definite lines of division among their respective state churches. Thus European Protestantism by 1600 had been divided into thirteen, and by 1650 into fifteen, distinct denominations. If the state churches which for all practical purposes operated as distinct denominations, are counted, then we shall have at least three more in the Lutheran group, and three more in the Reformed group, bringing the total to twenty-one.

Sectarian Spirit Manifested by Creed-making

Moreover, a wealth of evidence shows that these lines of separation were tightly drawn. The number of Creeds produced is in part a proof of that. The Bohemian Brethren eventually proclaimed their position in two Confessions, the First (1535) and the Second (1575), but only because these summarized thirty-two earlier and contemporary ones. The Lutherans eventually set forth their beliefs in two Confessions, the Augsburg (1530) and the Formula of Concord (1577), together with Luther's Longer and Shorter Catechisms of 1529; but Professor Heppe can give extracts from twenty others which appeared during the twenty-eight years (1548–1576).[2] The Reformed Church on the Continent was finally satisfied to have only four creeds—the Second Helvetic (1566), the Gallican (1551), the Belgic (1561), the Canons of the Synod of Dort of 1619,

[2] *Die Entstehung und Fortbildung des Lutherthums und die Kirchlichen Bekenntniss-Schriften desselben von 1548–1576*, cited in Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, p. 268, footnote.

together with the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563; but at least seven others between the years 1530–1631 exercised at times and places commanding importance. The Anglican Church was finally content with the Thirty-Nine Articles for a Creed; but it rested on at least five previous ones. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland eventually summarized its beliefs in one statement, the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1649; but it was built on no less than five previous Scottish Confessions and Covenants. In Poland The Consensus of Sendomir of 1586 proclaimed the existence of three orthodox Protestant Churches as "against the papists, sectarians and all enemies of the true gospel".[3] In Hungary by 1545 some twenty-nine ministers had drawn up Twelve Articles of Faith for Protestants which agreed with the Augsburg Confession; the Confessio Pentapolitana, representing five free cities in Upper Hungary was declared legal in 1555, while a Hungarian Confession was prepared and adopted by the Reformed Synod of Czenger in 1557 or 1558. The Anabaptists set forth their position in Seven Articles of Faith drawn up by Swabian and Swiss brethren as early as 1527, and this was followed by at least three others during the first half of the sixteenth century.[4] The Mennonites earliest Confession was in 1580, while five other statements followed by 1632.[5] The General Baptists in England published a " Statement of the Beliefs " as early as 1611; while the Regular or Particular Baptists beliefs were

[3] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, p. 587.
[4] W. J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, pp. 1–23.
[5] *Ibid*, pp. 24–49.

set forth by the seven churches of London in 1644, the Somerset in 1656, and their most authoritative Confessions in 1677. The Quakers first declared their beliefs in a statement in 1658, but there followed ten other apologetic statements by 1698, among which was Barclay's, their most acceptable one, in 1675. The Congregationalists made known their beliefs in the authoritative Savoy Declarations of Faith and Order in 1658. Twenty-two denominations had produced one hundred and ten Confessions of Faith. Could European Protestantism have been more successful during these years in building creedal fences with which to shut themselves in and others out?

Sectarian Spirit Seen in Certain Statements and Occurrences

Of even greater importance in showing the sharp differences existing among the various Protestant groups during this period is the intensely bitter sectarian spirit revealed by certain statements made and occurrences which took place during the time these Confessions were being forged in the fires of their faith. For instance, thru a misinterpretation of a statement of Zwingli's about breaking his head, Luther threatened to "let fly at Zwingli's snout (schnauze)", and tho the Swiss reformer repented and with tears begged forgiveness, the German reformer refused to shake the proffered hand, saying to him "your spirit is different from ours". Another instance is afforded by the action of the Conference of Augsburg (1530), which, after it had received the Lutheran Confession on June 25th, and Zwingli's

personal statement on July 8th, refused even to hear read the oldest Confession of the Reformed Church in Germany—the Tetrapolitan—which had been drawn up by Bucer, Capito, and Hedio (Heid) representing the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau —choosing rather to issue against it a secret Confutation filled with misrepresentations. The Colloquy at Leipzig held in 1531 between Lutheran and Reformed divines, while conducted in a commendable spirit, revealed lines of separation so sharply drawn that its sessions were held in secret, nor could its findings be published for a time, save by the consent of the representatives of the two schools of thought. A fight at the altar about the communion cup between Professor Heshusius, an extreme Lutheran, and Deacon Klebitz, a Zwinglian, supplied the public scandal which immediately occasioned the Heidelberg Catechism. Tho most auspiciously launched under the pilotage of Elector Frederick III, when Louis VI succeeded, its authors, Ursinus and Olevianus, along with six hundred other reformed ministers, were deposed and exiled—Lutherans being put in their places. The great Synod of Dort, 1618–1619, so nearly representative that for the Reformed Church it might justly be termed ecumenical, and professing a high degree of tolerance, would not give the Remonstrants a fair hearing, roiled the Lutherans, and split the Reformed Church of Holland by driving out some two hundred ministers of Arminian sympathies. In the British Isles by the end of Elizabeth's reign (1603) the conflict with Rome was ended; but the internal struggle among Conformists, Puritans, Sepa-

ratists, Presbyterians and Quakers had long begun, to whom were soon to be added the Congregationalists and Baptists. This bitter feeling was well rooted. Contact with the continental movement thru the Marian exiles brought into England and Scotland a fervor for theological discussion; while the views of Luther, Melanchthon and Calvin winning their devotees, with Calvinism in the end capturing both countries, heightened it. No discussion of the true and false theology or of church polity which had helped to widen the breach among the Protestant denominations of the continent failed to make a similar contribution to England and Scotland. Calvin, whose books had been prohibited by Henry VIII, corresponded freely with Edward VI, the Duke of Somerset, and Cranmer. His "Institutes" supplanted Bullinger's "Decades" in Oxford and Cambridge as a textbook of theology. Macaulay wrote, "The English reformers were anxious to go as far as their brethren on the continent". Bishop Jewel, the final reviewer of the Thirty-Nine Articles, said concerning Luther's doctrine of Ubiquity, that only "where the stones have sense" could it be accepted. James I met the Millenary petition of the Puritan ministers asking for the correction of certain abuses, by imprisonment of the ten petitioners. His later dictum concerning the Puritans was, "I will make them conform or harry them out of the land, or else do worse". Charles I and Laud gave the French and Dutch refugees the choice of conforming or leaving the country. England's Ambassador to France was not allowed in Paris to attend a Huguenot service, being instructed even to prevent the Dissidents from

going to America. In turn, those who had thus ruled with such implacable authority in favor of the High Church party, when Cromwell and his Ironsides got the upperhand, received measure for measure—for then two hundred registered ministers were ejected and given over to poverty and misery. With the Restoration under Charles II the Puritans, who were now called "hypocritical Pharisees, crazy fanatics with lank hair, sour faces, deep groans, long prayers, bigotry and cant", had, in turn, two hundred of their ministers deposed and left in poverty, misery, and prisons. In Scotland Knox was affirming, "one mass to be more dangerous to Scotland than an army of ten thousand enemies", and that he abhorred the religion of his queen, who was no better than a sorcerer of Beelzebub. He led the Protestants to sign voluntarily on December 3rd, 1557, their Covenant "to keep alive and prosperous to the death the whole congregation of Christ and every member thereof". Thru years of bitterest internal struggle the fight raged between Presbyterians and Anglicans, the former eventually winning. In all these statements and occurrences, taking place during the years when their Confessions were being fixed, we have what reveals even more clearly the obdurate sectarianism prevailing among these Protestant bodies. In their light Jenny Geddes is more than a poor old ignorant woman confounding "colic" and "collect," and hurling her famous stool at the head of an unfortunate dean, while she exclaims, "Villain dost thou say mass at my lug"; rather is she the symbol of the stubborn and permanent hostility harbored by all reformers toward every church which stood apart from their own.

Sectarian Spirit Deepened by Suffering

But the greatest proof of the awful seriousness with which Protestants espoused their Cause is shown in their readiness to endure all loss of homes and property, persecutions of all kinds, and even death in behalf of their particular bit of faith. John Laski of Poland, who for the sake of conviction refused a bishopric in the established order, preferring rather to be in a foreign land "a poor servant of Christ crucified for him", and after organizing three congregations of Dutch, German, French, and Italian emigrants in London, was driven by the Marian Reaction, together with one hundred and seventy-five of his flock, to Denmark, where he was refused shelter in the dead of winter because he would not subscribe to the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence in the supper, is simply typical. The readiness with which his flock left one country for another for the sake of faith, is also typical. Some Bohemian Brethren in 1548 had been driven from their native homes to live in Poland, and again, seventy-five years later "more than thirty thousand families, and among them five hundred belonging to the aristocracy, went into banishment".[6] The Anabaptists suffered at the hands of both Roman Catholics and Protestants, being put to death by drowning, hanging, and burning. Estimates of the number of Huguenots martyred in France, beginning with St. Bartholomew's Massacre, range from ten to one hundred thousand. In England "nearly three

[6] Heusser, *The Period of the Reformation*, p. 426. Quoted by Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, p. 577.

hundred persons, men, women, old and young, some all but children, let themselves be burned alive rather than to abjure", during the three years of Mary's reign.[7] "The ordinary method of Episcopal persecution in Scotland was not death. A devout and learned presbyterian pastor would receive notice to give up his parish. He and his family became exiles and wanderers, tho it was a criminal offence for anyone to receive them, or give them aid." [8] In the seventeenth century no less than 13,258 Quakers suffered fine, imprisonment, torture and mutilation in England, Scotland and Ireland, while 219 were banished, and 360 perished in prisons. Thus the free spirit of the Reformation which had fought the battles against the papacy, and brought to light the pure gospel, gave way to bigotry and intolerance among the Protestants themselves, so that almost everywhere, "underneath some form of established Protestantism was propagated an interdicted Protestantism", in the face of terrible persecutions. There is no doubt of their dead earnestness. Because they believed they had from God a command, which above all others must be obeyed, they went cheerfully to their doom. But the memory of such treatment served in the lives of those who were left to intensify animosities and to make them more determined than ever to fulfill what was thus regarded to be the command of God. Who is there to deny that such experiences did not serve to make denominational lines ever and ever tighter, and sectarian cleavages ever and ever deeper?

[7] Taine's *English Literature*, Vol. I, p. 376.
[8] Hurst, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. II, p. 730.

CHAPTER II

RISE OF PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

To keep in mind some such resumé of its European background, as the above, is essential to an understanding of the religious history of the United States. It throws light upon the source of its divided Protestantism, and in a measure accounts for the impetus given to its tenacious sectarian tendency. The permanent colonial settlers, coming as they did from the countries of northern Europe, necessarily brought with them the only Christianity they knew—a thoroly denominationalized Protestantism. Coming at just the period when the heat and passions engendered by a century and a half of religious controversy culminated; many impelled or forced to come for the sake of their Christian convictions; some could not if they would, while others would not if they could, have lost in transit across the Atlantic theories, ideals, and hopes which had shaped and fashioned their very being.

Those "Imported" to Colonial America

When, therefore, England settled her colony at Jamestown in 1607, the Episcopal church was a part of the established order; when other Englishmen emigrated to Plymouth in 1620, the Congregational denomination

was transplanted; when the Dutch of Old Netherlands emigrated to New Amsterdam in the New Netherlands in 1623–1628, by the majority of them was brought the Dutch Reformed church, tho some were Lutherans; when Sweden settled her colonials on the Delaware in 1628, they brought only Lutheranism; the coming of other Englishmen to Massachusetts and Rhode Island brought the ideas and theories from which sprang both the Particular and the General Baptist denominations; with the coming of other Englishmen to Massachusetts and Maryland during 1566–1672, Quakerism or the Friends denomination entered; when by 1640 still other settlers from England and Scotland came to Long Island and New Jersey, they brought with them the Presbyterian denomination; with the coming by 1638 of some other Dutch, German, and Swiss emigrants to Pennsylvania, the Mennonite denomination came in; while about forty-five years later another group of emigrants from the same three countries to Pennsylvania brought in the Amish Mennonite sect; when, beginning with 1708, the Palatinate exiles came to New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania, the German Reformed and the German Lutheran denominations were transplanted; while still other German emigrants between 1720 and 1734 brought into Pennsylvania two other denominations—the German Baptist Brethren, or Dunkard, and Schwenkfelder; the Moravians had by 1735 transplanted the United Brethren, or Unitas Fratrum, denomination; by 1752 some other Swiss emigrants to Pennsylvania brought with them the Brethren in Christ denomination, which later, either because its devotees lived by or baptized in a river, came

to be called River Brethren; by 1774 other emigrants from Scotland to New York and New Jersey had transplanted the Reformed Presbyterian denomination; with the coming of John Wesley and his co-laborers the Methodist persuasion was established by 1784; when John Murray and his fellow-laborers came, the Universalist denomination was brought in; and when another small group of English emigrants landed in New York in 1774, there came in also another denomination—the Society of Believers, otherwise known as Shakers. Thus by 1789, when George Washington was inaugurated first President of the newly formed Republic of the United States of America, of the twenty-eight distinct Protestant denominations present, which have continued their separate existence until to-day, nineteen had been "imported".

Several things had contributed to this preponderance of "imported" denominations over the number of Protestant divisions which arose here during the Colonial Period. The sheer absence of any Christianity, so that whatever forms of the Christian religion it might at the time come to house, had to be brought in, is obviously the primary cause. But the bigotry and intolerance European Protestants practiced toward each other, frequently culminating in harsh and frightful persecutions, also caused the transplanting of some of them. Still others, such as the United Brethren, Friends, and Methodists, for instance, were brought in by devotees who came primarily to evangelize the native Indians. As a matter of fact, this missionary motive was professed by many. For example, "the Royal Charters disposing of territories later known as Virginia, Massachusetts Bay, the Caro-

linas, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania set forth with considerable prominence and emphasis the obligation of several patentees to evangelize the savages."[1] While Professor Mode goes on to warn against setting a too high value upon what may have been a mere "conventionalism" in the phraseology of the charters, still he feels that "Englishmen, as the proponents of the Protestant faith, may naturally have been solicitous to show as high a regard for the propagating of religion as had the Catholics of continental countries".[2]

However, the general custom of European peoples during this period to regard the Atlantic seaboard of North America as a frontier section of their own countries helped as much as anything else in the transplanting of these numerous European denominations. From whatever country they may have come, and whatsoever may have been their particular brand of Protestantism, they did not feel themselves to be so much immigrants to a foreign land as settlers in the outpost sections of their own expanding empire. In this frontier section there was room, both for economic expansion, and territorial isolation, which insured freedom from persecution and consequent religious peace; therefore they came.

Those "Imported" 1789–1849

But it must not be surmised that the establishment of the new Republic at the end of the Revolutionary War put a stop to the long prevailing custom of bringing in Protestant sects from Europe. Such was not the case.

[1] Peter G. Mode, *Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*, p. 15.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

By 1792 the coming of other emigrants, leaders, and ideas from England to Maryland had transplanted the General Convention of the New Jerusalem sect; missionaries sent out by the Rhenish Missionary Society succeeded by 1840 in establishing among the German emigrants to Missouri the German Evangelical Synod of North America; other German emigrants entered New York state in 1842 for the principal purpose of bringing with them the Amana Society sect; English missionaries, including Hugh Bourne, came to set up the Primitive Methodist denomination, and were successful in so doing by 1844; a coterie of Germans, who had opposed the union of Lutherans and Reformed churches in their homeland in 1817, began coming to the United States in 1839, and by 1845 had organized themselves into the Buffalo Lutheran Synod, and another group of Dutch emigrants to Michigan in 1846–1847 brought in the Christian Reformed denomination. Thus the sixty years intervening between 1790 and 1849 witnessed the "importation" of six additional Protestant sects from Europe.

Those "Imported" 1850–1899

Nor is that all. Thru the coming of emigrants, the activities of missionaries, and the rise of divisions in the parent stems in the old countries, the Plymouth Brethren I was brought from England and set up here by 1850; the Catholic Apostolic Church was brought from Scotland and England by 1851; Plymouth Brethren II entered from England by 1855; Friends of the Temple was imported from Germany to begin life here from 1862 on; the Evangelical Union of Bohemian and Moravian Brethren

began its career here as a denomination in 1864; the Danish Evangelical Church in America arrived by 1872; the Mennonite Brethren Church from Russia and Crimea was launched in the Middle West during 1873–1876; the Hutterian Brethren Mennonite Church from Russia began its life in South Dakota by 1874; the Conference of Defenseless Mennonites, also from Russia, was set up in Nebraska and Minnesota by 1873–1874; the Salvation Army entered thru trained leaders sent from England and started on its career in our larger cities from 1881; while the Evangelical Lutheran Jehovah Conference from Germany, thanks to the efforts of missionaries from the same country, was successfully functioning as a separate sect by 1893. So the fifty years from 1850 to 1899 were destined to greet twelve imported denominations—just twice the number brought in during the preceding sixty years.

Those "Imported" 1900–Present

And finally, from the same causes as those of the last-named period, the Norwegian-Danish Free Church was brought here by 1910; the Evangelical Protestant Church of North America by 1911; the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America was founded in 1917 to unite three previously established sects of Norwegian Lutherans; the Kleine Gemeinde Mennonites entered from Russia; and a small group of Regular Baptists, continuing their separate denominational life and claiming to represent the pure and unadulterated Baptist stream which flowed in during the seventeenth century, closes the story. So, from 1900 down to the present, five denominations have been brought in.

Thus Protestantism in the United States owes a total of forty-two of its denominations to direct "importations" from Europe. England supplied fifteen of them, and had a part in one other. Holland is wholly responsible for two, and helped in supplying two others. Scotland gave one, and helped in supplying two others. Switzerland helped in furnishing two. Bohemia and Moravia are wholly responsible for two. Russia is alone responsible for four. Denmark and Norway supplied one apiece, and shared equally in giving two others. While Sweden presented only one, she furnished all there was of it.

A careful analysis of these forty-two imported denominations reveals two facts of interest. For one thing, they have all persisted as distinct divisions in American Protestantism since the date of their establishment. Nothing that can be said is able perhaps to carry greater weight in proof of the unyielding hold which the sectarian spirit has on its devotees. Set down in new surroundings, with new demands of adaptation thrust upon them, yet they continued their separate existence, and do still.

Again, these imported denominations include the main parent stems from which have branched all the denominations in the United States except two—the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints (Mormons) and the Christian Scientist. These two are indigenous to our country, apparently unrelated in their origin to any that were brought in.

Beginning of Native Sects in Colonial America

However, when Europe's contribution to America's denominational history is thus fully acknowledged and

accredited, almost three-fourths of the story, viewed alone from the standpoint of the number of denominations now present, still remains to be told. From the Colonial Era till to-day, the United States, within its own rights, has ever been a fertile field for Protestant divisions. Within thirty-five years after the landing of the Pilgrims the process of sectarian separation began, when, in Providence, the Six-Principle Baptist sect was organized. About twenty years later enough members withdrew from the First Baptist church in Newport to begin the Seventh-Day Baptist denomination. While these two constituted the crop of home-grown Protestant divisions in the seventeenth-century Colonial America, the remaining ninety years of that Era were more fruitful, since seven new divisions, the German Seventh-Day Baptist; the Freewill Baptist; the Associate Synod of North America (Presbyterian); the United Baptist; the Free Baptist; and the Unitarian denominations then arose. So, by the date of Washington's inauguration as first President of the new Republic, a total of nine native sects were added to the nineteen imported ones.

Native Sects Born 1789 to Present

Perhaps it was to be expected that this proneness to separation among American Protestants would be accelerated by the establishment of the United States government with its policy of religious freedom. Anyway that is what happened. The first sixty years (1790–1849) of its history witnessed the rise of twenty-nine denominations. During the next fifty years (1850–1899) fifty-five

more denominations came into existence, while from 1900 to the present nineteen additional ones were launched.[3]

European Influence on Native Sects

But there are certain facts which should be kept in mind relative to this unusual growth of denominations in American Protestantism, if it is to be intelligently evaluated.[4] Not the least of these is the continued European influence. This comes to light in several ways. For example, the Plymouth Brethren are now divided into six sects, but at least one of them (VI) resulted here from a split which took place in England. The American Rescue Workers arose because of a rift between the Salvation Army headquarters in this country and the Home office in London. The Associate Synod of North America (Presbyterian), the Evangelical Synod of Iowa (Lutheran), and Plymouth Brethren III were established here in part thru the labors of missionaries sent from Europe. Three other denominations, the German Seventh-Day Baptist, Disciples of Christ, and Christa-

[3] Really down to the listing of the 1916 *U. S. Religious Census.* If there are additional ones since that date—which is likely—their story has not been available to the writer. See Addenda, pp. 329–343.

[4] Due to their number the names of these denominations have not been included in the body of the text. But see Appendix A, p. 303 and following for complete list, together with pertinent facts. The following table gives by periods the rise of denominations in the United States.

	Imported	Native
1607–1700	10	2
1700–1789	9	7
1790–1849	6	29
1850–1899	12	55
1900–Present	5	19
Totals	42	112

delphian, had for leaders in their formation immigrants from Europe, whose work here was shaped by their religious training and experience there. Thus at least eight divisions in American Protestantism can attribute their rise to a very direct connection with the Old Country.

Then, the religious requirements of immigrants from various non-English speaking countries occasioned the planting here of at least twenty other denominations. After its original importation the earliest division caused by race and language took place in the case of the Old Amish Mennonite Church. To retain the German language, then being replaced by the English, caused its rise. The Wisler Mennonites, for the sake of the German language, also set up their separate existence. This same factor operated at the time of its inception in the case of the United Brethren in Christ sect, when Otterbein's labors to form a church suitable to the German-speaking peoples of Pennsylvania were rewarded so successfully. To retain the German language the Evangelical Association came into existence. One sect, the German Evangelical Protestant Ministers Association, withdrew from German-speaking churches to form an English-speaking denomination. Racial, linguistic, and theological differences (tho racial and linguistic are primary) made it necessary to form one Bohemian and Moravian, one Icelandic, one Danish, one Swedish, three Finnish, one Hungarian Reformed, and eight German Lutheran denominations.[5]

[5] The sects referred to in this sentence do not include "imported" branches of the same churches.

Frontier Influence and Native Sects

However, there still remains a sufficiently large number of Protestant denominations to be accounted for to indicate that some features of life in the United States must have been peculiarly favorable and especially adaptable to their origination. That is true. One of these is found in the circumstances of the frontier life of our country.[6] As the colonial settlers on the Atlantic seaboard still thought of themselves as citizens of the fringe of their European homelands, but in the isolation and the relative freedom of their new surroundings were able to set up religious institutions more to their hearts' content, so the gradual expansion of our civilization, from the east across three thousand miles of territory to the west, has always furnished a degree of isolation, independency, and venturesomeness most happily suitable for nurturing the sectarian spirit among its citizens. As western communities sprang up they furnished a field for home missionary labor conducted by the longer established eastern sections whence the western settlers had come. The competitive aspect of this denominational expansion has been represented humorously, tho with truth, by some such statement as this "When the Westward Bound Missionary Special arrived in a town, it was found to have a Baptist for an engineer, a Presbyterian for a fireman, an Episcopalian for its conductor, a Congregationalist for a flagman, all the rest for passengers, save the Methodist—he rode on the cow-catcher". Anyway, it could always be

[6] Peter G. Mode in his *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*. The book is a splendid treatise on this subject, tho as it applies to the rise of new sects he carries it too far.

assumed that as many denominations as there were in the East would be taken as soon as possible into every section of the West. Moreover, if the proffered denomination for any reason failed to commend itself to him in his comparative isolation and independent spirit, the western frontiersman produced a sect of his own that was pleasing.

Without doubt from such conditions have sprung many Protestant divisions, and a fertile soil thereby has been provided for growing small sects.[7] But there is danger of making too much of it, as the following facts relative to ninety native denominations will show. Two originated in New England during the seventeenth century, and five between 1700 and 1789, in the territory contiguous to the Atlantic seaboard. But of twenty-four which arose from 1790 to 1849, nine originated west, and fifteen east, of the Alleghanies. Of forty-three which came into existence from 1850 to 1900, twenty-one sprang up east of the Alleghanies, fifteen in the territory lying between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, while seven only arose in the section beyond the Father of Waters. Of fifteen which were born within the last twenty-five years, four originated east of the Alleghanies, five from there to the Mississippi, and six beyond. To be sure those which arose during the Colonial Era came out of frontier conditions, no matter what particular section gave them birth. But unless we interpret "frontier" to apply to the oldest, most thickly populated, and highly industrialized areas of our country, as well as to the newer, most sparsely settled and largely agricultural sec-

[7] See Mode's *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*, especially Chapter V.

tions, then it has not been a dominant factor in giving rise to the larger part of the ninety Protestant divisions under review. Of those in this list which came into being since 1850, almost one-half originated east of the Alleghanies, or, in other words, in the most highly industrialized section of our nation. As a matter of fact, New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts gave rise to eighteen of the twenty-five.

Politico-Religious Theories

While we must acknowledge the frontier spirit to be one means of transforming the life of our country into a social milieu in which the sectarian mind and denominational habit could finely flourish, still we shall have to search elsewhere for the most important agent in that process. Our politico-religious theory of the separation of church and state, and philosophical individualism combined, reveal it.

When the American government was founded, Christianity had for more than two centuries in different countries been struggling for freedom from governmental control or dominance. Those who came to this country from Europe in many significant instances had been impelled to come thru a desire to escape the political oppression at home. To a very great extent immigrants were attracted to this pioneer country because it could truthfully be termed "the place free for all possessions in a civil and sober way, there is no persecution for religion nor ever likely to be".[8] It is true that the optimism

[8] *American History by Contemporaries*, Vol. II, pp. 65–68, "The Poor Man's Paradise."

of that writer was doomed to receive a setback when persecutions broke out against the Quakers and Baptists in both New England and Virginia, yet the persecutions only strengthened the purpose of those who suffered, to compel, if possible, their government to grant freedom of worship for all sects. This was gained when the revolution was won, the colonies were freed from the political control of the Mother Country and established their government on the democratic principle that all men are created free and equal and should therefore have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Philosophical Individualism

To safeguard this liberty and freedom of thought was the philosophical theory developed since the Reformation, making the individual, rather than any organization to which he belonged, the item of first consideration. The ultimate foundation of public life and of social coherence was laid in the interest of the individual. To the political contract by which the individuals unite themselves in a community of interests, is attached the contract of a sovereignty or subjection, by means of which the individuals hand over their rights and authority to the magistracy.[9] Thus the individual arrives at adulthood in political and religious freedom. It was for his benefit that the state and church existed. It was his inalienable rights and privileges which he along with others had transferred to a common cause that furnished the foundation of the state. So it was his privilege not only to choose the political character of his government,

[9] Windelband, *A History of Philosophy*, p. 432.

but also the type of church to which he was to belong. Religion had restrained the capacity for means to grow unto perfection, which restraint had caused all the evils of society.[10] Only in one way could the highest interest of the individual be conserved in a society, a great part of which had come to feel that religion was harmful *per se*—and that was to allow those who wanted it to have it, and those who did not want it to discard it altogether. In any case perfect liberty of choice in beliefs and practices was guaranteed.

No one would question this ideal of religious liberty. Nevertheless, with the absence of all external authority to guide or influence the character and limits of religious organization, which this glorious freedom brought, one result could be rightly expected, and that actually occurred—to wit—divisions and sub-divisions of Christians into large and small denominations *ad libitum*. All Christians, individuals and organized groups, were free to develop after their own desires. In the Christian or religious sphere, perhaps more than in any other, this freedom-right found full and abundant expression. This was due in part to the fact that little of financial and commercial interests were involved. Great institutions, with large endowments and great financial returns, had not grown up to hold any check over the feasibility of denominational divisions. But the extreme of sectarianism to which this spirit of freedom led, was fostered even more largely thru the knowledge that the practice of the right was glorified far more than deprecated. The most serious thing that could happen to a liberal in any

[10] Windelband, *A History of Philosophy*, p. 522.

denomination was to disfellowship him. But that would not worry such an one who knew that if he were of a strong intellect, vigorous personality, possessing a ready gift of speech and a facile pen, he could organize another church in accord with his own special desires, or else find an existing denomination which he could join. Ignorance of existing organizations, or, if known by name, lack of knowledge of their tenets and practices, made it much more natural to start a new denomination.

However, the politico-philosophical theories, combined with the frontier nature of a great part of our civilization, at best supplied a satisfactory social atmosphere in which the rise of denominations could easily take place. The immediate causes which divided American Protestants into one hundred and fifty-three groups lie elsewhere. These are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

WHY PROTESTANTS SEPARATED

Let it be said at the outset that the immediate causes of denominational cleavages in Protestantism embrace almost all the different aspects of theological belief, theories of church polity, and sociological ideas ever advocated by its leaders. So, neither the fondness of a writer for details nor the patience of a reader can hope easily to encompass them all; but it will not prove a too formidable undertaking to treat them in a general or summary fashion.

Nature and Function of the Lord's Supper

One would naturally expect the Lord's Supper to have been a bond of union. As a matter of fact, it early became a cause of disunion. Luther, in his interpretation of the personality of Christ, held that his divine and human natures were so conjoined that the man Jesus was in all his words and works the expression of his divine nature, a unity which made his body of flesh a spirit-body, and as such possessed an ubiquitous quality that rendered it omnipresent. Wherefore, the Lutherans following this theory of Luther's affirmed that "the (true) body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine) and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received)".[1] Zwingli interpreted the person of Christ so

[1] *Augsburg Confession* (1530), Article X.

that his human nature ended when Christ left the earth, and altho now possessing a spiritual body, Christ could have no earthly presence except a spiritual presence, nor any appropriation or dispensation except a spiritual one. Wherefore, the Zwinglian Reformed group, following this interpretation of their leader, declared there was no real presence of Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine; that these were only signs of the body and blood offered in sacrifice on Calvary; the only presence of Christ in the Supper was thru "the contemplation of faith";[2] and therefore it was really a memorial celebration designed to remind of the redemption wrought by Christ, thru the observance of which his followers professed adherence to him and their purpose to lead a Christian life.

Calvin and his followers in their teachings occupied a mediating position.[3] As phrased in their Confession it runs as follows: "The outward element in this sacrament . . . remains truly only bread and wine" but "worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in the sacraments, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death, the body and blood of Christ being thus not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually present, to the faith of the believer in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses".[4]

[2] Seeberg's *History of Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 320 (Hay's Translation).

[3] See *Later Helvetic Confession*, Chap. XXI, and *French Confession*, Sec. XXXVI.

[4] *Westminster Confession*, Chap. XXIX, Articles 5 and 7.

These three interpretations—Luther's transubstantiation, Calvin's consubstantiation, and Zwingli's symbolico-memorial—constitute the main Protestant positions on the Lord's Supper. Almost all the smaller sects, such as the Anabaptists, Mennonites, Baptists, and Schwenkfelders, agreed with Zwingli's views and interpreted the Supper as a memorial. Two denominations, the Quakers and Unitarians, dispensed entirely with its observance—the former because they looked upon "the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples as a figure", a mere shadow of better things, and not therefore, to be continued by those who had obtained the substance; [5] the latter because of their conception of the person of Christ.

The question as to who should partake of the Supper occasioned about as serious concern as that of its content. The Lutherans felt that both the worthy and unworthy should be invited to it; the Reformed churches held that only believers, who thru faith could appropriate its blessings and benefits in a spiritual manner, should be admitted to partake; in this the Mennonites agreed; the Anabaptists and Baptists, while welcoming only believers, admitted only those believers who had been immersed. Open communion practiced by the Freewill and Original Freewill Baptists of the southern colonies served to separate them from other Baptist groups.

The Function, Subject, and Mode of Baptism

The function, subject, and mode of baptism also became among Protestants an early source of dissension.

[5] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. III, p. 797.

The Lutherans taught [6] that thru baptism "the grace of God is offered", forgiveness of sins achieved, deliverance from death and the devil effected, and everlasting salvation given to all who believe. Its power to accomplish this came from the "word of God which is with and in the water, and a faith which trusts the word of God in the water". Thus it became a "washing of regeneration". The Reformed bodies declared [7] baptism to be "a sacrament" by which one is "enrolled, initiated and received into the covenant, into the family and inheritance of the sons of God". Moreover, while they declared it to be "a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated". Touching the function of baptism, the majority of the smaller sects agreed with the Reformed position, holding it to be a ceremony of church membership. The subject of baptism occasioned greater differences among them. Lutherans and Reformed, including Anglicans and Congregationalists, retained infant baptism, the former because by it children were offered to God and are received into His favor; [8] the latter because infants "ought to be baptized and sealed with the covenant, as the children of Israel formerly were circumcised upon the same promises which are made unto our children ".[9]

[6] See *Augsburg Confession*, Part I, Article IX, and Small Catechism, Part IV.

[7] See *Belgic Confession*, Article XXXIV; *Second Helvetic Confession*, Chap. XX, and *Westminster Confession*, Chap. XXVIII, Sec. 5.

[8] *Augsburg Confession*, Part I, Article IX.

[9] *Belgic Confession*, Article XXXIV, also *Westminster Confession*, Chap. XXVIII, Sec. 4.

The Anabaptists, Baptists, and Mennonites contended that believers only should be baptized.[10] The mode of baptism was by sprinkling or pouring, until around 1640 the Particular Baptists began to use immersion, which not long thereafter was adopted by the General Baptist group also. The River Brethren in their origin added trine immersion. The Schwenkfelders insisted that the mode of baptism was unimportant, a position later assumed by many other denominations, notably the Methodists. The Quakers set it aside as unessential.

Five Points of Calvinism

Then the Calvinists, whose theological ideas reigned in the Reformed creeds, thru their doctrines of total depravity; unconditional election; prevenient and irresistible grace; perseverance of the saints; and limited atonement had locked the greater part of the human race in a black dungeon of utter hoplessness from which there was no escape to anything except perdition. To be sure in the case of the few elected, neither the weaknesses of the flesh, nor the natural perverseness of will, could thwart the foreordained purpose of God to bring them to salvation; [11] but they came into their kingdom apparently devoid of personal character and by way of a via dolorosa pathetically powerless in a world of sin.

[10] See *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, W. J. McGlothlin.

[11] See *Canons of the Synod of Dort*. First Head, Articles VI, VII and IX; Second Head, Article VI; Third and Fourth Heads, Article III; and *Westminster Confession*, Chap. III, Chap. VI, Section 2, and Chap. XVII, Section 1.

Arminianism

Opposition to these Five Points of Calvinism came from both Lutheran and Reformed. The former in their Saxon Visitation Articles unmitigatedly condemned this extreme predestinarianism and election, thereby widening the breach between the two main branches of Protestantism.[12] But the most serious discussion took place within the ranks of the Calvinists themselves. James Arminius led the revolt, rejecting outright unconditional elections, limited atonement, and irresistible grace, and casting doubt on the point of the final perseverance of the saints. He and his followers in the Five Arminian Articles [13] stated their belief to be that salvation was conditioned upon man's ability to exercise faith, an unlimited atonement, and a non-irresistible grace, "in as much as it is written concerning many that they have resisted the Holy Ghost". The Arminians were certain also that those who thru faith had become ingrafted into Christ enjoyed full power thereby to overcome the world, the flesh and the devil with nothing in the Scripture to confirm the belief that they could fall from grace.[14]

These abstruse theories of theology have been very influential in giving rise to Protestant divisions. Adherence to Arminianism directly accounts in part for the setting up of the Free Baptist, Freewill Baptist, Methodist, United Brethren in Christ, Evangelical Joint Synod

[12] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. III, p. 189, and *Augsburg Confession*, Article XII.

[13] *Ibid*, Vol. III, pp. 545–549.

[14] See *Arminian Articles* IV and V.

of Ohio (Lutheran), and the United Norwegian Synod (Lutheran) denominations. Many other sects, such for example, as the Salvation Army use it for a foundation on which to base their appeal to men. Adherence to Calvinism in addition to the many branches of the Reformed church almost wholly accounts for the existence of the Duck River Baptists, Primitive Baptists, and the Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists.

Adherence to the Seventh Day

Four denominations, the Seventh-Day Baptists, the German Seventh-Day Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists, and the Church of God (Adventist), trace their origin wholly or in part to the belief that only by the observance of the Jewish Sabbath can Christians obey the commandments of the Bible. The belief that Christians should attain unto a state of absolute holiness in this life had a greater or less share in giving rise to several of the smaller sects, including the Hephzibah Faith Missionary Association, the Apostolic Christian Church, the Missionary Church Association, and the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene.

The Second Coming and Immortality

Strangely enough since other bits of faith of no greater importance had been so employed, belief in the second coming and hope of immortality did not become divisive measures until the nineteenth century. But taken together and properly stressed, they proved a prolific source of disunion from that date. Edward Irving of London and his sympathizers during the first half of the century

used the dogma of the second coming to build the Catholic Apostolic church. Tho that sect was transplanted to this country, yet independently of it a movement here led by William Miller was destined to become the nucleus of several sects. Miller, a licentiate of the Baptist denomination, thru study of pertinent Scripture passages convinced himself, and so predicted, that Christ would return between March 28, 1843, and March 31, 1844. Since all the dead were in a conscious state, at the moment of his coming, the redeemed among them would be raised to reign with Christ on the earth for a thousand years, after which the unredeemed would be raised to suffer eternal punishment. This Pre-Millenarianism gained many adherents, and because in their opinion it was not properly stressed by the sects to which they belonged, but rather opposed,[15] enough believers left the Baptist, Methodist and other denominations to launch, with Miller, the Adventist sect on its separate course. Then, due to speculations among the Adventists themselves about such questions as the nature of the dead; who would and would not be raised at the time of the second coming; would Christ set up his earthly kingdom before or after his millenarian reign; were all the dead in a conscious state or just the redeemed; would the dead rise or sleep eternally; they were split up into the Advent Christian church, Seventh-Day Adventist, and the Life and Advent Union sects.

Closely akin to the Adventist speculations were those advocated by a physician (member of the Disciples of

[15] The Methodist Maine Conference officially condemned the movement led by Miller.

Christ denomination), John Thomas by name, to the effect that the human soul by nature was mortal and only upon Christians would the gift of immortality be bestowed, the wicked suffering eternal death. In order to give to his ideas the pre-eminence desired the Christadelphian sect had to be set up. However, the latest split arising from teaching on the second coming is the Temple Society, or the Friends of the Temple. Developed from pietism with a chiliastic tendency, its central tenet is that Christ will reign upon earth with Jerusalem as the center; after a group of model lives have formed a nucleus with whom Christ may begin his reign, and the Moslems have been removed from Jerusalem.

Questions of Church Membership

Who should be regarded as members of, or allowed to join, the church—all baptized children of believing parents, or only those who experienced conversion? That question, debated since the Reformation era, eventually gave rise to the doctrine of regeneration as a prerequisite to church membership, which, combined with immersion as the mode of baptism, furnished one of the chief cornerstones of the Anti-Pedobaptist denominations, especially the battle cry of the Baptist branch of Protestantism. In its insistence upon an experiential faith in contrast with the formal religion of eighteenth century England, Methodism transferred the birthday of a Christian from the date of his infant baptism to that of his conversion, and by so doing caused both the Primitive Methodist and the Methodist denominations to embody the general idea. The same doctrine was the chief cause of the

formation of Eilsen's Synod (Lutheran) and the Defenseless Mennonite Church.

Forms and Functions of Church Government

Another leading cause of divisions involved the form and function of church government or polity. The Lutherans, following their general policy of changing the existing order as little as possible, retained the Episcopal system, adapting it to meet local needs, substituting in many countries superintendents for bishops, and seeking in every feasible manner to increase the authority of the people as a controlling power in the affairs of the church.[16] The German Reformers set up the Presbyterian system consisting in each local congregation of teaching and ruling elders with boards of deacons for its guidance, then a Presbytery composed of delegated representatives from local churches as nearly as possible equally divided between clerical and lay members; a synod covering a larger geographical area whose members were similarly chosen; and a General Assembly of delegated members from the various Presbyteries to rule the whole church, and declared this to be *jure divino*, claiming it truly represented the type in the New Testament church. This position was justified perhaps, since the papal government which it sought to supplant rested upon a like claim and a change could commend itself to the sixteenth century mind or be accepted by any large number of people only by claiming an equal authority. With local variations it

[16] See *Augsburg Confession*, Articles VII, XIV, XV, and XVI. Also Vol. IV, *American Church History Series*—"The Lutherans," pp. 12–15, by Jacobs.

became the polity of the Reformed church everywhere on the continent, and of the state church in Scotland.

However divine it may have been, it did not win its way in England. The English Reformers, not desiring such radical change as Presbyterianism implied, were content to free their church from papal control by transferring its headship to the English Crown, and to form a government which would be a "via media between Roman Catholicism and continental Protestantism".[17] This they accomplished thru their system of hierarchical episcopacy, nor could the long struggle for mastery between these two types of government bring any change. In the earlier years of reform the Church of England leaders did not deny the validity and scripturalness of the Presbyterian system and non-Episcopal ordination; such men as Richard Hooker, Joseph Hall, James Usher, and William Wake actually admitted with varying degrees of emphasis that "episcopacy was not necessary for the validity of the sacraments", and where bishops were not to be had, ordination by presbyters was sufficient. But from the time of Bancroft another school arose, represented by such men as Jeremy Taylor, Hammond, and Laud, which made episcopacy essential not only to the well-being, but to the very being of the church. So at the close of the seventeenth century, Presbyterianism ruled in Scotland and the Episcopal hierarchy in England—the adherents of both claiming them to be *jure divino*.

Contemporaneously with the above arose still another form of church government—the Congregational. From

[17] F. W. Head, "The Church of England," Vol. III, p. 646, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*.

the date of their beginning, the individualistic Anabaptists opposed all denominational administration, holding that the local church was the unit of supreme authority in church affairs, and that the minister should be supported by the congregation which called him. In this general position the Mennonites concurred. But the Congregationalists, standing for the abrogation of all clerical prerogatives, saying the local church assembly with its members and officers possessed full power to govern themselves in all doctrinal and disciplinary concerns, thus setting up the autonomy of separate congregations and holding the church to be wholly independent of civil magistrates and the state, were the ones to give those theories influential pre-eminence and to supply for them a name. The Baptists espoused this form of government and, in a modified form, the Quakers also.

These three types of polity—the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational—have dominated Protestantism everywhere, and in so far as questions of church government have given rise to the different denominations, they deserve the credit, or discredit therefor. Transferred to this country they have been the cause of many disruptions when variations from types have been attempted. Efforts to change, modify, or to introduce new factors into an authoritative episcopacy have resulted in helping to form at least four new sects; the Methodist Protestant Church, which wanted a lay representation in the Annual and General Conferences; the Congregational Methodist Church, which sought the privilege of a local church's calling its own pastor; the Free Methodist Church, whose ministery desired a fairer

plan of clerical promotion; and the Reformed Episcopal Church, which protested against a too strict ritual and the traditional conception of episcopal ordination.

Variations from Types of Polity

Variation from type is revealed in the origination of some of the Presbyterian sects. It was partly in protest against the Synod's authority in refusing to grant the local church the privilege of calling its own minister that the Associate Presbyterian church was formed. In so far as the United Presbyterian church embodied the position of the Associate Reformed body this same protest was influential in its formation. Revolt from a too authoritative synodical rule partly caused the formation of the Immanuel Synod (Lutheran), the Finnish National church (Lutheran), and the Evangelical church (Lutheran).

The desire to embody features of all three types helped to give the Moravians and the Mennonite Brethren in Christ their separate existence. Desire to have some form of church government above that of the local congregation divided the Plymouth Brethren, the group III being formed so that it might have a delegated assembly with absolute judiciary powers, dissent from whose rulings would result in being disfellowshipped. A further variation of the Congregational polity is seen in the case of the Church of God Adventist, the findings of whose General Conference are absolute in all matters referred to it.

Progressivism versus Conservatism

Naturally any deviation from doctrinal beliefs and types of polity creedally fixed or established thru tradi-

tional practice would be most difficult of accomplishment in any group, but the interplay of progressivism and conservatism has been especially divisive in many smaller sects. Sometimes it was the conservatives, at other times the progressives who withdrew, but nearly always any attempt to introduce changes of either a social or religious character, which would be more in keeping with the trend of the times, proved disastrous to existing unity. Because some Amish Mennonites were yielding to the demands of modern style of dress and in other ways seeking to adapt themselves to surrounding social conditions, the conservative element withdrew and founded the Old Amish sect. The Reformed Mennonites were a reactionary element who got their name by trying to reform their sect backward to the status of Simon Menno's age. The Wisler or Old Mennonite church likewise was formed by those who opposed, to the point of separation, the introduction of Sunday schools, revival meetings, evening worship, and higher education. The spirit of retrogression called into being the sect of United Brethren (Old Constitution) because its members objected not only to any change in the constitution to make it new, but also to any change from a hostile to a friendly attitude toward secret societies. Both the Old Order German Baptist Brethren (Dunkards) and the York River Brethren sects were started by those who refused to conform to the world even to the limited extent of allowing jewelry or modern style clothing, or carpets, paintings and fine furniture in their homes. Desire to maintain the *status quo* of doctrine and practice established by creeds and customs was largely influential in calling into being the General Church of the New Jeru-

salem; the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran church in North America; the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference; and the Ohio, Buffalo, Eilsen, and Iowa Synods of the Lutheran church. While opposition to Sunday schools, missionary societies, or any form of benevolent work founded on a monetary basis was the tap root on which the Primitive Baptist sect feebly persists.

On the other hand, some smaller sects have separated from the parent stem for the sake of progressive change. Of these the Progressive Dunkers, who were determined to conform to modern style of dress, and to open the door of their church to any whose belief was scriptural; the New Apostolic church, which demanded the right to fill vacancies in the apostolic list of officials when occasion demanded, as well as to increase the number of apostles if necessary, are outstanding examples. The General Conference of the Mennonites was based in part on new ideas and practices introduced by Oberholzer; while the Immanuel Synod (Lutheran) was formed to accommodate those who tolerated and received members of secret societies as well as to maintain friendly relations with sister denominations.

Controversies over such matters of course appear to outsiders peevish and absurd; but to those involved they were profoundly significant, and therefore deserve as respectful treatment by a student as any other causes of dissension.

Religious Revivals

Denominational divisions have frequently resulted during periods of great revivals. The cause for this

appears to be that at such times revitalized Christians, becoming keenly aware of encasing formalities, ceremonies, and institutions which long years of gradual progress (or retrogression) in the religious life have set up, demand essential changes. But since these customary forms and methods of activities thru an elastic and pliable expansion seem incapable of adaptation to the requirements of the reawakened Christian life, the result has often been to organize a new sect, thru which it could freely find expression. Thus the Separate Baptist sect was formed by those who favored the revival carried on here by Whitefield, Tennant, and others, but who could not remain in the Particular Baptist and Congregational parishes because these, generally speaking, opposed the movement. Both here and in the Mother Country a great religious awakening, at once a protest against the cold formalism of the established church and the moral degeneracy of the times, nevertheless disavowed by the Church of England and frowned upon by many American sects, gave rise to the Methodist denomination.

In an even more direct fashion revivalism gave rise to the Evangelical Association, the Cumberland Presbyterian, and the Primitive Methodist denominations. The latter was formed thru the confluence of two streams of revivalists, one from the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, the other from the regular body of Methodists, both of which had as their *raison d'être* the keeping alive (thru camp meetings, etc.) of the evangelistic spirit of the Wesleyan and early Methodism. When the spiritual enthusiasm of a revival movement among the

Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Kentucky and Tennessee had produced a gracious harvest of souls (tho accompanied by such violent extremes of bodily contortions that educated ministers turned from it), since a sufficient number of cultivated ministers could not be found to care for the churches into which these converts had gone, and since the Presbyterian church opposed the employment of inadequately trained ministers, for the sake of peace the Cumberland Presbyterian sect, which would make use of trained or untrained clergymen, had to be formed. A like result followed the revival movement led by Jacob Albright among the neglected German-speaking people of Pennsylvania. The converts he won insisted upon the use of the German language in their service, and being opposed on this point by the Methodist church to which Albright belonged, they had to start a new sect—hence the Evangelical Association. Revivalism, tho in a lesser degree than was true of the last three named, gave rise to the United Brethren in Christ, organized to care for the converts of Philip Otterbein's evangelistic zeal, which had been opposed by the German Synod of Pennsylvania; the Mennonite Brethren in Christ, to care for their own converts; the Swedish Evangelical Missionary Covenant sect, which sprang from a revival movement in the old country; the Apostolic Faith Movement; the Penial Mission; the Metropolitan Church Association; and the Heavenly Recruit Association. Almost all of the smaller sects classed "Evangelical Associations" were started in order to foster evangelistic work, wherever and whenever it seemed to their organizers that the revival spirit was

on the wane. To this same revivalistic tendency belongs the rise of both the Salvation Army and the Volunteers of America.

Spiritual versus Formal Christianity

Another factor of sectarianism, in spirit akin to, if not a phase of, revivalism, has been the emphasis upon the spiritual aspect of Christianity in opposition to a cold formalism. Kaspar Schwenkfeld, of mystical tendencies, stressing the need of an immediate participation in the benefits of divine grace, drew to himself a following that has persisted in a separate organization for three hundred years. The pietist, A. Mark Hoehman, similarly sought to have the spiritual supersede dogmas and creeds in the formation of the Baptist Brethren (Dunkards) sect. Due in part to opposition to the stereotyped forms of faith and practice the Plymouth Brethren set up their existence so as to have a simple service and worship in the breaking of bread The same emphasis played a part in the establishment of the Catholic Apostolic and Hauge's Synod sects. But this factor is most clearly revealed in the case of the Quakers. This sect, founded by George Fox and his co-laborers, dispensed with baptism and the Lord's Supper, creeds and ecclesiasticism, had no fear their people would contradict Scripture, gave equal privileges of spiritual ministry to both men and women, all on the basis of their doctrine of the Inner Light, of the Illumination of the Soul by the Holy Spirit. Their lives were so thoroly spiritualized by their heavenly citizenship that civil affairs were matters of no concern.

The Search for Unity

A strange irony of fate decreed that the search for unity among existing denominations should give rise to six new Protestant sects—three in part and three in entirety. Of these the earliest to arise was the Church (General Convention) of the New Jerusalem, founded by the followers of Emanuel Swedenborg. He was a mystic, and in the minds of his followers a divinely illuminated seer and prophet sent to establish a new dispensation to supersede that of Jesus Christ. He based the unity of Christendom on the employment of two aspects of mysticism. One of these brought the believer into such direct fellowship with God, the conscious inhabitant of the spirit world, that a spiritual unity of Christians was affected, the preservation of which depended not at all upon doctrines and creeds and only in a secondary sense upon ecclesiastical machinery. The other led to the interpretation of the Trinity to be of essentials—not persons—believers in which possessed the real basis of religion. Theories of a vital counterpart between everything on earth and in heaven, whereby for every earthly society of believers there was a society of heavenly angels, and for the three hells of the lower realm, three heavens in the higher realm, etc., etc., completed the scheme. But as is natural, these highly speculative and metaphysical theories never commended themselves to the masses, with the only result possible—the organization of those who held them into a new and small additional sect.

A movement which had for its chief objective the unification of divided Protestantism was that led by

B. W. Stone and Alexander and Thomas Campbell. Stone viewed with deep concern the divisions and party spirit among professing Christians, especially since they were nurtured and upheld by human creeds and forms of church government;[18] while in the Declaration and Address proposed by Thomas Campbell and concurred in by his father, Alexander Campbell, it was affirmed that "the church of Christ upon earth is essentially one, intentionally and constitutionally one", that "division among Christians is a horrid evil fraught with many evils", and divisions "are anti-Christian since they destroy the visible unity of the body of Christ".[19] The project of unification proposed by these men was a return to the plain teachings of the New Testament, allowing it to speak for itself its divine message uninterrupted by human intervention, so that every doctrinal claim and administrative policy would have for its basis a "Thus saith the Lord". As Proposition XII of the Declaration and Address declared: "All that is necessary to the highest state of perfection and purity of the church upon earth is that none be received as members but such as having that due measure of spiritual self-knowledge described above, do profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures; that her ministers duly and scripturally qualified inculcate none other things than those very articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the word of God, and that in their administrations they keep close to the observance of all divine

[18] *The Last Will and Testament*, p. 24.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 107 and 112.

ordinances after the example of the primitive church exhibited in the New Testament without addition whatsoever of human opinions and inventions of men." [20] But the dreams of these enthusiastic unionists foundered on the same rock on which all such dreams have foundered when the effort to unite Christendom on the basis of a return to the New Testament teachings has been employed—namely, that of varied interpretations given to the plain words of the New Testament as to what were the essential ordinances, practices, and polity in the maintenance of the church life of which it speaks. Tho honestly disparaging sectarian divisions and craving Christian reunion, their own requisite of immersion as the true form of baptism made it as impossible for Pedobaptists to join them as their criticism of denominational differences and insistence upon their basis of reunion made it impossible for the Presbyterian and Baptist churches to tolerate them. Their consequent withdrawal started the Disciples of Christ and the Christian Communion denominations on the way of their separate existence.

Still other denominations which at the time of origin entertained the hope of being sufficiently elastic and pliable to unite Christendom were the Apostolic church; the Church of God in Christ (Winebrennerians); the Non-Sectarian Church of Bible Faith; and the Christian Congregation. The method pursued in each case was an attempted return to the ideals, customs, beliefs, and practices of the New Testament churches. The first of these embraced twelve apostles in its scheme of organization, and imitated the early church by speaking with

[20] *Historical Documents, Advocating Christian Union*, pp. 113–114.

tongues and nurturing prophetic vision; the Winebrennerians were so literal that they believed foot-washing to be an ordinance worthy to take its place beside baptism and the Lord's Supper; while Rev. Lyman H. Johnson, the founder of the third-named sect, rested his hope of reunion upon his own special interpretation of the word "ecclesia" as referring to those who had been called out from the world. But in each of these cases the movement petered out in a narrow literalism which could have only one result—the addition of a new sect to the long list already existing. To try to unite Christendom thru a return to the New Testament church appears disastrous to the cause of unity. At least all evidence to date points in that direction.

Different Interpretations of the Bible

For as a matter of fact, a leading cause of disunion thruout their history has been the different interpretations given by Protestants to what the Holy Scriptures—their sole authority of faith and practice—taught and emphasized as being essential to the life and progress of the Christian church. The two principles of Biblical interpretation followed by the Lutherans and Reformed bodies—whereby the former sought to retain in their polity and practice what was not contrary to the Scriptures, and the latter sought to reject all that the Scriptures did not command—greatly helped to widen the chasm between these main bodies of Protestantism. The Lutherans, on the basis of their principle, kept ecclesiastical rites (made by men) which might be observed without sin and were profitable for the tran-

quillity and good order of the churches, such as fixed holidays, feast days, fasts, confessional, paraphernalia of ritual, the episcopacy,[21] etc. The Reformed wing, on the basis of their principle—while not rejecting the "allotment out of time" so the churches might celebrate the Lord's nativity, circumcision, passion, and resurrection—set aside all feast days and fasts, ivory, gold and precious stone ornaments, adopted a simplified form of worship in which preaching was magnified, and substituted for episcopacy a polity more in keeping with their interpretation of what the New Testament model of church government was.[22]

In this country professed adherence to the teaching of the Bible is a reason offered by the majority of Protestant sects as explanation of their separate existence. In the United States Religious Census Report for 1916 the doctrines and polity are described, in the case of at least 25% of the various sects, thru the stilted and well-thrummed phrase "the Bible is (for this denomination) the sole rule of faith and practice". Theoretically of course, the claim is true of all denominations; but practically it can only be applied to their special interpretations of it.

However, this slavish adherence to the New Testament record as a cause of sectarianism is best illustrated in the case of those sects, which, without any thought of reuniting Christendom and regardless of the differences between the cosmic, social, and religious theories prevailing in ancient and modern times, set out to

[21] See *Augsburg Confession*, Part I, Article XV; Part II, Articles IV and VII, and *Formula of Concord*, Article X, Section 5.

[22] Vol. V, p. 403 f., *American Church History Series*.

reproduce the literal New Testament church. Wherefore the German Baptist Brethren practice trine immersion, reception of church members by the holy kiss, observe the communion in the evening, and require their women-folk to wear a prayer covering or veil during service. The Old Order German Baptist Brethren, together with some branches of the Mennonites, introduced non-salaried ministers. The Six-Principle Baptists must have "the laying on of hands" as a part of their receptant ceremony into the church. Others practiced anointing with oil in the case of sickness. While at least six sects (two of the Dunkards, Primitive Baptists, Duck River Baptists, Winebrennerians and United Zion Children) adopted foot-washing as an integral part of the church's life—by some of them to be observed in the evening preceding the communion service, with one person to bathe and dry the feet; while with others one person bathed and another dried them.

The Institution of Slavery

The institution of slavery precipitated a number of divisions in American Protestantism; but only five of these persist down to the present. A strong anti-slavery sentiment in the Methodist denomination, led by Orange Scott, reached a crisis in the General Conference of that body in 1840. When it was discovered that the report, which a reference committee had drawn up, stated that no definite action or declaration against slavery would be taken, the advocates of anti-slavery gradually withdrew, forming the Wesleyan Methodist Church, dating from 1841. Similar results followed in the Methodist

General Conference of 1844, when Bishop Andrews of Georgia, who thru inheritance and marriage had become the owner of slaves, was asked to desist from performing the duties of a bishop so long as he was a slaveholder. This action of the Conference brought the matter at once to a crisis, and since the laws of the state would not allow him to free his slaves, and there was a strong sentiment in the Southern division of the church against such drastic action being taken by the Conference on the question, the Southern delegation, resenting the move, proceeded in 1845 to organize the Methodist Episcopal Church South.[23]

Slavery divided Baptists into northern and southern groups. The matter had been discussed for a good while. Within the year or two preceding the break Dr. Wayland representing the northern wing, and Dr. Richard Fuller representing the southern wing, had carried on a strong and frank, tho affectionate, debate over the matter. But the memorial of the Alabama State Convention to the Foreign Mission Board requesting that the slaveholders be entitled to equality "with non-slaveholders, to all the privileges and immunities of their several unions; and especially to receive any agency, mission, or other appointment, which may run within the scope of their operation or duties" brought the reply from the Board that it could "never be a party to any arrangement which would imply approbation of slavery".[24] This action was sufficient to show that the Baptists of the two sections could not henceforth work together

[23] Vol. V, p. 460 f., *American Church History Series.*
[24] Newman, *History of the Baptists*, pp. 446–447.

peacefully. The immediate result was that the Baptists of the southern states sent their representatives to Augusta, Georgia, in May, 1845, and there organized the Southern Baptist Convention.

Divisions in the ranks of the Lutherans and the Presbyterians came later. It was in 1862, when the General Synod of the Lutheran church passed a resolution pledging support to the Federal Government in which the following clause appeared: "The rebellion . . . most wicked in its inception, unjustifiable in its cause, unnatural in its character, inhuman in its prosecution, oppressive in its aims, and destructive in its results to the highest interest of morality and religion." Further, it declared its disapprobation of those synods which gave "sympathy and active co-operation to the cause of treason." Very naturally this resolution proved extremely offensive to the southern members of the Conference. Consequently they withdrew and organized the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (South) in 1863.[25]

This same question of slavery produced separation among the Presbyterians. The New School Presbyterian denomination split over the issue in 1854, giving birth in the South to the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. These two bodies united in 1864, forming the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

The Factor of Personal Influence

Another cause of Protestant division rarely mentioned and hard to evaluate, because of its elusive nature, in-

[25] Vol. IV, *American Church History Series*, p. 451 f.

volved the factor of personal influence. The story of Protestantism, both in its rise and subsequent break-up into numerous sects, is inseparably linked with the life and work of outstanding leaders. Luther, the reformer, with his fiery, impulsive nature; Melanchthon, the scholar, with his quiet, peace-making tendencies; Zwingli, the democrat, with his love of liberty; Calvin, the logician, with his fondness for government and rigid discipline; Bullinger and Beza, with their powers of interpretation and clarity of expression in creed formation; Hubmaier, with his eloquence to popularize the Protestant cause; and Simons, who could resurrect a defeated cause and bring it back into popular favor; Arminius, the theologian, with his belief in free will; all exercised a determinative influence in continental Protestantism, and gave to it its bounds and restrictions. Nor is it possible to think of Presbyterianism in Scotland apart from John Knox; or of Episcopacy in England apart from Henry VIII, Hooker, and Laud; or of Congregationalism and Baptists apart from Browne, Jacobs, Smyth, Helwys, Greenwood, and Spillsbury; or of Quakerism apart from Fox and Barclay.

Likewise, a chapter on American sectarianism, which needs to be written by some one possessing both a keen historical sense and powers of accurate psychological analysis, is that of the influence of certain pivotal leaders in the story. Their number is far too large to enumerate here,[26] nor is it possible to cite their personal idiosyncrasies in a brief space; but apparently they all possessed a strong conviction of being right; inflexibility

[26] But see Appendix A.

of will; fearlessness of criticism; willingness to be called inconsistent or even queer; readiness to suffer any degree of inconvenience necessary to establish the beliefs they held dear—elements of character which helped to make them sectarianists. That some of them at times were motivated by personal ambition and desire for applause can hardly be doubted. Moreover, hunger for authority and the power which the position of leadership carried may have influenced others. But whatever the motives and aims of these men may have been, the fact remains that personal singularities have been plastered upon the sects which some of them were instrumental in originating.

Two Indigenous Sects

However, tho regarded as a part of the stream of Protestantism, there are two indigenous American sects which must be given a separate treatment, because of the peculiar circumstances of their origin and subsequent development. Of all the items in the list of causes of our home-grown denominations the last-named alone applies to these. The earliest to be formed was the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, or Mormonism. The factor of greatest influence in its rise was of course Joseph Smith with his special revelation. Thru some of these (given on plates which had the appearance of gold and were filled on both sides with Egyptian characters which he was able by the gift and power of God to translate) Smith supplied the Mormons with their sacred scriptures; thru others, learned that he and Oliver Cowdery were priests in the order of Aaron,

and should therefore found churches. This they proceeded to do. When Smith was killed in 1844 at Carthage, Illinois, Brigham Young succeeded him as prophet, and in the course of the next three years moved to Salt Lake City, Utah, where denominational headquarters were established. Here the larger and most effective branch of Mormonism still has its central location; while a smaller division, claiming to be the true Latter-day Church in virtue of having Joseph Smith, Jr., the eldest son of the founder, for its head, has its headquarters at Lemoris, Iowa.

Including belief in God as Father, Christ as Son, the Holy Spirit as Comforter, salvation thru repentance for sin and faith in Christ, Mormonism agrees with other Protestant churches. But the tenets and practices which distinguish this sect from the remainder of Protestantism are many, and spring from the extraordinary claims of its founders. It empowers its ministry to act as official representatives for the Lord Jesus Christ and places the Book of Mormonism on a par with the Bible. One chief difference between the two branches of this sect is that the Iowa wing disavows the revelations which Brigham Young claimed to have had in 1852 regarding polygamy. Mormonism in both wings has been well described as follows: "It is a syncretistic religion blending the dominant religious ideas, the superstitions, the emotionalism, the practical genius, the social ideas and the vices of the American frontier life of a hundred years ago." [27]

The second of these indigenous sects to come to life

[27] Walter Rauschenbusch, *The Record*, p. 62.

was the Church of Christ Scientist. It sprang from the labors of Mary Baker Eddy, who set forth the essence of its doctrinal system as follows: "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite mind and its infinite manifestations, for God is all and in all. Spirit is immortal truth, matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and the eternal, matter is the unreal and the temporal. Spirit is God and man is his image and likeness. Therefore man is not material he is spiritual." [28] Again she affirms, "the three great virtues of spirit—Omnipotence, Omnipresence, and Omniscience—spirit possessing all power, filling all space constituting all science, contradicts forever that matter can be actual." [29] Denying that matter is real, and on the basis that all is mind or God, it began a process of mental healing and profound concern for physical well-being, while denying anything physical. Moreover, its theories embraced enough of the New Testament teachings to classify it among the Christian churches, tho the only authoritative interpretation of the Bible is that of Mrs. Eddy. It claims to be a creedless church and in polity possesses no ecclesiastical organization. As the mother church the Boston organization holds the honored position, but the local branches scattered thruout the world are absolutely free to manage their own affairs.

Cessation from Division

Such are some of the principal and immediate causes of the break-up of Protestantism into its one hundred

[28] *Science and Health with a Key to the Scriptures*, p. 468.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

and fifty-three denominational divisions. Such a brief recital of them as is here presented amply testifies to the rampant spirit of sectarianism so long dominant in Christian circles in the United States. However, there are these items of encouragement for one who bemoans division. For one thing, the tendency to separate is dying out—at least that appears to be true of the larger and more significant family groups. Of the fourteen Baptist divisions eight of them came into existence prior to and during the eighteenth century, the others in the first half of the nineteenth. Their latest separation took place in 1845; so, for eighty years, anyway, Baptists have been content to get along with those divisions previously formed. Of the six native Presbyterian sects five arose prior to 1850, and one in 1864; so for over sixty years the Presbyterians have been willing to let at least the *status quo* remain. For forty-five years the Methodists have refused to add a new denomination, and the Mennonites for one-half a century have remained in their sixteen existing sects, while the Lutherans and Reformed branches have avoided additional divisions for years.

The other item is this: The temper and spirit of our religious life to-day point to reunion rather than division as the future ideal. All of Part II of this book is given in proof.

CHAPTER IV

THE GOOD IN SEPARATION

A defence of denominational divisions or any reference to benefits accruing therefrom is difficult to find. The task of historians, as conceived to-day, is, naturally, neither to defend nor to overthrow; it is to recite the story of facts and processes, and since the evils of sectarian division have been more evident than the benefits, more have dwelt upon this aspect of the question. Nevertheless, Christian society enjoys decided benefits hardly to be accounted for on any other ground than the presence of Protestant denominations.

Exaltation of the Bible

For one thing, they have given the Bible a place of prime importance in religious thought. While it is not possible to say what would have happened had history taken another course, this much is certain; without sectarian divisions, each one claiming to be founded upon New Testament principles, fostering the Biblical doctrine of life and death, and making earnest appeal to the Bible as the ultimate authority in faith and practice, there would never have been the study of the Biblical teaching and consequent knowledge of it which we have to-day.

Religious Liberty

The measure of religious liberty which we enjoy has been due in part to Protestant divisions. The separation of church and state has contributed to the multiplication of sects, but before this policy was so thoroly established as to become a social milieu for sectarianism, a few denominations themselves had helped to create it, as, for instance, the Baptist, Quaker, and Presbyterian. This religious liberty we enjoy to-day under the form of liberalized religious thinking. The right of private judgment and a developing theology, constantly demanding new forms of expression in Protestantism, reveal the benefits which sectarian divisions have brought to modern society. So to interpret these facts is not to say these blessings could not have resulted on some other basis, but only to acknowledge the fact that they did not.

This liberty is expressed also in the emphasis which denominationalism imposes upon all Christian truth. Taken as a whole, sects have stressed many non-essentials; but who can deny this was a necessary process, thru which much of essential value had to be brought to light. As another has expressed it: "It is common to hear deprecations, sorrowful or scornful, of the lack of theological consensus in Protestantism. Such opinions overlook the fact that this lack of consensus represents the salvation of religious thinking from disastrous speculation. Whatever merits may attach to the Catholic conception of a churchly faith is over-balanced by the inability of such a rule to do justice to the whole truth of a worldwide religion." [1] The larger thinking of Protestantism, its

[1] C. C. Hall, *Universal Elements of the Christian Religion*, p. 85.

breadth and vitality of view as conceived to-day, have resulted in no small degree from the emphasis which Christian truth has received at the hands of the various divisions. The crystallization of religious thought at the time of the Reformation was one of the inevitable outcomes of the centralization of religious authority in the hands of a few with power to legislate the form and content of doctrine. Denominationalism has prevented Protestantism from falling into the same error, and its reunion will never be desirable until it carries the privilege of elasticity in doctrinal expression and right of individual opinion.

Mutual Denominational Respect

Moreover, present-day religious toleration and mutual denominational respect have resulted in part from sectarian divisions. It is no paradox to say that the very points which have forced chasms in the general Protestant landscape have now come to be indirectly the bridges which span those chasms and lead to a spirit of understanding and forbearance. It is now acknowledged that each sect contains only partial elements of the whole Christian truth, and therefore, no one of them can disregard the truths held by all other Christian bodies. If one sect should claim doctrinal and ecclesiastical superiority, for the sake of the respect and tolerance it craves for itself it in return gives respect and tolerance.

Stimulated Christian Education

Denominationalism has also made a distinct contribution to the cause of Christian education. This is strik-

ingly evident with reference to the earlier years of our country's history. Some of the present-day famous universities, which have drifted in varying degrees from their sectarian moorings, nevertheless owe their origin to the sane desire of early denominational leaders for Christian institutions of learning. For instance, Harvard University "had its inception in a desire of the early settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to preserve and perpetuate in their new home the classical and theological learning acquired by many of them at the University of Cambridge and to educate the English and Indian youth in knowledge and godliness".[2] Its first name, Cambridge University, was changed to that of Harvard in honor of Reverend John Harvard, who in his will left it his library of two hundred and fifty volumes, together with half of his estate. Its first presidents were ministers, thus betokening the great debt it owed to the Christian churches, even apart from material endowments. Yale University came into existence during the fall and winter of 1700–1701, thru the initiative of ten of the principal ministers of the New Haven Colony, all but one of them graduates of Harvard, who met at Branford, Connecticut, and founded a Collegiate Institute by gifts of books for a library. In October of 1701 the Colonial Assembly granted a charter to this newly-born educational institution, which made the same ten ministers and their successors trustees of the Collegiate School of Connecticut, locating it at Saybrook. Fifteen years later it was moved to New Haven. So again we trace the origin of

[2] Article "Harvard University" in the *New International Encyclopedia*, p. 748, Vol. 10.

one of America's greatest universities back to the activities of denominational ministers. Rutgers College, located in New Brunswick, New Jersey (since 1864 called the State College for Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, and since 1888 the location of one of the United States Government Experiment Stations), is justified in having to-day for president a member of the Dutch Reformed church, since its origin in 1776 was due to men like Henry Rutgers and Theodorus J. Frelinghuysen, members of this denomination. Princeton grew from the Log College, founded in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, by William Tennant in 1726, up thru the College of New Jersey, fostered and fathered by the Presbyterian Synod of New York, on up thru its changed location from Elizabethtown to Newark, then to Princeton, New Jersey, in 1752, and is still one of the proud possessions of the Presbyterian denomination. A college begun thru the initiative of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, transplanted to Rhode Island in 1764, because that colony was Baptist in origin and popular attachment, called Rhode Island College until 1804, became Brown University in honor of Nicholas Brown of the class of '86, a Christian layman, member of a Baptist church. Hobart College, projected in 1812 by Bishop Hobart of the Episcopal church, from whom it derives its name, was and is an offspring of that denomination. In addition there are: Columbia University, whose first site was given by Trinity Church of the Episcopal denomination; Northwestern and Boston Universities, historically connected with the Methodist Episcopal church; Colgate University, originating in the gift of thirteen dollars from thirteen Christian laymen; and

the present University of Chicago, established at the instance of prominent Baptists thruout the country and made secure by the gifts of John D. Rockefeller, Sr., to take the place of the former University of Chicago, a Baptist institution opened in 1852 and because of lack of funds closed in 1886.

A large number of outstanding colleges likewise have come into being as a result of denominational work. Of these it will suffice to name the following: Dartmouth, which sprang from the work and mind of Reverend Eleazer Whitlock; Smith, made possible by the gift of some forty-five thousand dollars by a devoted communicant of the Episcopal church; Mount Holyoke, whose founder, Miss Mary Lyon, regarded her work so Christian in character that when she came to write its history, she entitled the work "The Missionary Offering"; the Randolph-Macon System, furnished to the country by the Methodist Episcopal church; the present University of Richmond, made possible at first and supported now by the Baptists; Wake Forest and Meredith Colleges, Baptist institutions in North Carolina; Elon College, springing from the work and labor of the Christian denomination; Guilford College, brought into being by the Friends; and Duke University, built on the old Trinity College of the Methodist Episcopal church (South). There is a total of fifty-five universities; four hundred and eight colleges and junior colleges; one hundred and fifty-five preparatory schools (furnishing an opportunity for education to people of all sects and of no sects), which are under denominational control. When we add to the above, sixty-two Bible and training schools, and the one

hundred and thirty-four seminaries, the total number of educational institutions now under the control of the various denominational groups amounts to eight hundred and fourteen.

The sheer magnitude of this work is impressive. One cannot escape the conviction that the intellectual standard of the country would have been greatly inferior had it not been for this particular form of sectarian activity. A stream of influence for the moral and spiritual health of our country has gone out from this work which it would be difficult to over-estimate, for a college closely identified with some Christian denomination has honestly sought to teach the true basis of character as well as to impart a strong intellectual training.

Immigrant Education

Another distinct contribution of sectarianism to education is related to the immigrant population. Some denominations, for instance, the Presbyterian, Northern Baptist, and Methodist Episcopal churches have founded schools for the benefit of the various racial groups. Typical of these is the International Baptist Seminary of the Northern Baptist Convention at East Orange, New Jersey. Here young men from a half-dozen different races are trained for the ministry to their own people. What such a work will mean only the future can tell. The point here is this: But for denominational interest in their education probably no such provision for the training of these groups would have been inaugurated. So whatever the future may hold in store for the educational life of our people, it is sheer folly to close one's eyes to the

tremendous contribution in this field which the various denominations have already made, and in a number of worthy instances, are making to-day. Wherefore, it may be a good thing that, of the one hundred fifty-three Protestant sects in the land, over one-half, or eighty, have one or more institutions of learning which they control.[3]

The Appeal to the Masses

Again, denominationalism has furnished a field of restricted interests commensurate with the capacity of the mind of the masses. Christianity has to be presented to people on the plane where they live; and the large majority of people do not live in the broad fields of Christian expansiveness, but in the limited spheres of particularized Christian views. This restricted mental interest of the average person may be due partly to the accumulated responses made to reiterated sectarian applications of the gospel, but it also arises from something deeper—for witness its presence before the multitude of denominations arose. More likely it is an inevitable psychological phenomenon due to centuries of training in particulars rather than in generals; in segments rather than the entire circumference of the circle. The piece of ground of which one is fond is not just any ground, but his own particular farm or lot, authoritatively staked off by a surveyor, for which he has paid his money. Illustrations could be extended to include all of one's interests from birth till death. Every generation has its seers; but not all people of every generation are seers. Every

[3] *Year Book of the Churches*, 1923, pp. 9–252.

age has its leaders; but every age furnishes more and more people who must be led. Wherefore, in saying that the denominations meet the requirements of the average restricted interests, the writer does not mean to use a tone of disparagement; rather, he seeks to be perfectly honest in analyzing facts as they appear to exist. Denominations enjoy only the same preferment that hundreds of other group organizations—clubs, fraternities, political parties, and what not—enjoy. Millions have been able to find their religious demands served by a sectarian presentation of the gospel, far better than by its presentation from an interdenominational point of view. "If I am at hand," writes one, "when the day of a united church comes, I hope that church will be of such a nature that I can be a Quaker in some moods, sitting silent to await the stirrings of the spirit, and a ritualist in other moods, entering into a subtle communion with the souls of the past thru the use of words dear to that past, and a crusader rejoicing in Christian conquests in other moods still, listening to stories of gain in great cities or on far-away mission fields." [4] This interesting statement beautifully sets forth the Christian breadth of sympathy possessed by a large number of people; but if it were turned into a religious demand for all, as many more people would be absolutely incapable of sincere response to it. The Roman Catholic church has long recognized this matter of wide divergence in the innate religious capacity of its adherents, and has provided for it by greater or lesser demands for piety and holiness, as well as by variety in forms of worship. James Huneker

[4] *Living Together*, Bishop F. J. McConnell, p. 61.

was not far wrong when he declared that the Roman Catholic church is the wisest mother of all in applying psychological principles.[5] So, were there only one Protestant denomination, it would have to adapt its program to a platform sufficiently broad to include types of emotion as well as grades of intellect. Up to the present time denominationalism has had the advantage of being able to meet these primary requirements, and in no small degree sectarianism has flourished because it could do so.

Distinctive Separateness

Another demand of this restricted average mind which denominationalism has served, is a craving for distinctive separateness. There is so much sameness forced upon people thru social, educational, and economic customs, that it is a relief to be able to turn to one prime necessity of human life—religion—without being forced thru the pipeline of dead level uniformity. People do not like to belong to the same religious organization to which all others belong. Any pastor can testify to this. He knows, too, how easily injured these same people can be by any effort to minimize these sectarian points of difference. For him to affirm that the power of suggestion may be helpful in certain functional diseases may be by them interpreted to mean that the speaker is tainted with the doctrine of Christian Science, which is most unmoral if he be a member of some other denomination. Their attitude of protest arises not as much from the truth or falsity of the claim, as from the danger

[5] James Huneker, *Steeplejack*.

of narrowing the chasm between the Church of Christ Scientist and their own.

The gist of the matter has been well expressed by a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly:* [6]

"Liberals talk of consolidating the churches. Well, suppose the churches were to be really consolidated, not only all Baptist churches merged with Methodist, but the synagogues, the Friends' meetings, the Roman Catholic churches, the Greek Catholic churches, and all the variety of Protestant churches reduced to one or two very large, strong, centrally located churches fitted with plenty of amplifiers. The Sunday morning service would not be the meagre, narrow, intense service of the old churches; there would be a sermon by the rabbi and one by the Quaker, a reading by the Christian Science leader together with an exhortation by the priest, a discourse by the Naturalist and one by the Supernaturalist. The churchgoer, sitting there among his twenty or thirty thousand fellows, would not exactly 'hear both sides'; he would hear only what would give offense to none; real differences would change automatically to mere formal indifferences. These consolidated churches would be financially better based, more efficient. And religion would be free, very free indeed, so broad it would eventually be pretty nearly flat."

Surely sectarianism expressed thru one hundred and fifty-three Protestant denominations has been a Gibraltar against any possibility of institutionalized Christianity's ever becoming "broad, so broad" as ever to be

[6] Samuel Strauss, "Things Are in the Saddle," November, 1924.

"pretty nearly flat". They have guaranteed sufficient peaks, if not pinnacles, ever to allow the Christian landscape to appear too drab or monotonously flat. They have furnished abundant chance for distinctiveness in religious theory and practice, and being able to do so, have enjoyed an advantage not to be overlooked.

A Healthful Rivalry

Then, divisions have brought into the life of the Protestant churches a measure of healthful rivalry. With two or more churches of differing faiths located in a community, seeking to gain the support of the people, it is difficult for either of them to become careless about the tone of its worship, quality of its preaching, and dignity of its music. Building equipment, programs of activities, and serviceable ministration have been oftentimes forced upon a higher level by this friendly competition. It has also stimulated to a greater interest in behalf of those outside the churches. Sometimes it has helped to a greater financial liberality than could have been attained otherwise. Nor has the effect of this rivalry been limited to local fields. Regarding such matters as missionary endeavor, educational facilities, charitable institutions, and old-age pensions for ministers and missionaries, entire denominational programs have been beneficially affected by it. Perhaps it ought not to be thought strange that this factor should play an important rôle in the religious life of a people who have been influenced by it in so many other interests, and have followed in their business affairs the slogan "competition is the life of trade".

Notable Achievements

However, there is nothing which reveals the strength and vitality of sectarianism in this country as much as its achievements to date in the religious life of the people. While both the Greek and Roman Catholic churches have contributed of their influence, and the Jewish religion has always been present, yet it has always been, and is now, true, that the various Protestant denominations have wielded the predominant religious influence. So it is only recognizing a patent fact to say that whatever the spiritual condition of the country is to-day, the Protestant denominations are overwhelmingly responsible.

Upon the basis of statistical reports, while there is much to be attained before the country's religious life can be recorded as anything like 100% strong, yet the situation is by no means discouraging. According to the Federal Census of 1916, counting all religious bodies, there were 41,926,848 church members out of a total population of 105,710,620.[7] Limited to Protestant denominations only, there were 27,545,450, and restricted still further to the white Protestants, there were 23,700,801. When it is noted that practically all included in this number of white Protestants are members of the churches from choice—far the larger proportion of them attracted to it thru the training and persuasive appeal of the Christian faith presented by the Protestant forces as now organized—one cannot help but be impressed by the efficiency thereby shown.

[7] 1920 Federal Census. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

Moreover, there has been a slow tho sure increase in the number of Protestant church members from year to year. Using the same census report as a basis of calculation, the increase in white Protestants from 1890 to 1906 was 5,513,366, and during the decade (1906–1916) it amounted to 6,264,861. These figures are encouraging in that they show a greater gain during the ten years from 1906–1916 than took place during the sixteen years from 1890–1906.[8] Again this speaks well for the Protestant forces in their existing state of division. Likewise, a creditable degree of advance for Protestantism is shown when the growth of church membership is contrasted with the growth in the total population over these years, as in the following tables:

INCREASE IN POPULATION

Census 1890	*Census 1900*	*Census 1910*	*Census 1920*	*Census 1922*
6,294,774	75,994,575	91,972,266	105,710,620	108,000,000

INCREASE IN CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Census 1890	*Census 1906*	*Census 1916*	*Federal Council Report 1922*
21,699,434	35,068,058	41,926,854	47,407,251

Thus while the population has increased 68% during thirty-two years (or at the rate of 2.125% per annum), church membership has increased 118.4% (or at the average rate of 3.7% per annum), giving it a small but steady advance over population. Further, in 1890 the

[8] These figures calculated from the *Federal Bulletin* 142, 1916, pp. 150–154. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

church membership was 34% of the population; in 1922 it was 45%.[9] Moreover, there has been an increase of between three and four millions in the years 1916–1922.[10]

Another cause for pride in Protestant growth is in the increase of gifts for missionary work. The Federal Census for 1916 reports this amount to be, for Home Missions $42,905,797, and for Foreign Missions $15,233,898—a total of $58,139,695.[11] The same denominations gave in 1921–1922, for Home Missions $26,374,387, and for Foreign Missions $38,671,158—a total of $65,045,545.[12] If to the contribution for mission work is added that given for local expenses, the Protestant forces of the country gave in 1925 the handsome sum of $463,871,678.[13]

Another factor betokening a healthy state in the life of Protestantism is the increasing number of young men entering the ministry. Speaking for the years 1924–1925, Dr. Carroll says: "The number of ministers shows an encouraging gain. As laborers in the vineyard fall or reach the limit of useful service, younger men take their places and carry forward the work. The net gain in 1925 was 2,966. Since the beginning of 1920 the increase has been from 194,047 to 216,078 (or 22,031 in six years), an average of 3,672 annually, which cannot be reckoned as discouraging."

Furthermore, the vigorous church-building program so much in evidence in recent years indicates the vitality

[9] *Federal Council Year Book for 1923*, p. 399.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 401.
[11] *Federal Bulletin* 142, 1916, pp. 99–100.
[12] *Year Book of the Churches*, 1923, pp. 402–415. In some cases report was for a year or two previous to 1921–1922.
[13] Dr. Carroll's Report in *The Christian Century*, April 15, 1926.

of Protestantism. People do not give money readily for objectives which they regard as non-essential; that they are certain of the intrinsic nature of denominational work is attested by the following facts from the Federal Census:[14] In 1890, 154,282 organizations reported 135,352 church edifices valued at $940,078,364: in 1916, 207,573 organizations reported 187,150 edifices valued at $1,266,964,041. In other words, property values increased $388,657,096 from 1890 to 1906, while the increase from 1906–1916 was $326,885,677. This large increase does not mean that the additional amount was wholly contributed thru voluntary offerings by the Protestant constitutency. It includes debt on church property as well as "unearned increment" due to rise in property values. But making due allowance for these two items, there will remain increase enough to show that the Christian religion in America, functioning thru its numerous denominational divisions, is fairly successful in getting its membership to contribute large voluntary offerings for necessary expenses. This financial appeal seems to be growing in power too when it is noted that the average annual increase in property value for the years 1906–1916 is greatly in excess of the annual increase for the years 1890–1906. In the first sixteen years it is over twenty-four millions per year; in the second period of ten years it is over thirty-two millions per year. Church officers estimate that seventy-five millions were spent on new church buildings in 1925 alone. The highest point previously reached was fifty millions.[15]

[14] *Federal Bulletin* 142, pp. 150–154. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

[15] *The Christian Century*, April 9, 1925.

Such growth in membership across the years; such large voluntary outlay of money to propagate the gospel at home and abroad; such expenditures to furnish church buildings and adequate Sunday school quarters; such response to the work of the ministry—all of which has taken place under the leadership of Protestantism in its present divided state—is ample proof of its splendid efficiency, and strongly attests the vigorous hold which the various denominations have upon their constituency. "The Interchurch World Movement was an eloquent and tragic testimony that there is no 'Class B' composed of large-hearted Christians without denominational affiliations. The people in America who are doing things for humanity in any big way are still pretty much found in the denominational fellowship." [16]

No one is capable of determining what would have been the present religious condition of the country had it been built up under the guidance of a unified Protestant church, for the data for such an estimate is lacking. So, whatever may be said to the contrary, the present religious life is a product of denominational activity, and it is a product of real and permanent achievement.

[16] Editorial, "The Denominations not Dying," in *The Baptist.*

CHAPTER V

THE EVILS IN SEPARATION

Loss of Spiritual Fellowship

Unfortunately, not all results of denominational divisions belong to the credit side. There are manifest weaknesses in the organized expression of Protestantism which are directly traceable to its divided estate. One of these is the loss of spiritual fellowship, and a consequent narrowing of religious vision. The sects could learn much from one another if they would. Those characterized with a leanness of form in their worship could be taught by those having a reasonable amount of formality. The reverse is also true. Those which stress activity to the comparative neglect of pietism could profitably go to school to those which emphasize the deeper spiritual illumination and fellowship with God. And *vice versa*. Denominations which possess a rich historical sense have something to share with those which lack it, while those sects with a popular democratic appeal have something to teach those whose weight of ritual hampers the spirit. Any denomination that has successfully ministered to the spiritual needs of its own constituency has a message which might be of help as well to those who are outside its circle. However, anyone familiar with the problem knows how extremely difficult it is to set up such reciprocal helpfulness. The erroneous belief that the mere

association with a name condemns a practice without regard to the value of the practice itself; fear that adopting a custom of another church will lessen existing distinctions, combined with an ignorance of the origin of modes of worship, make it practically impossible. Church leaders may at times act in this matter as did Beecher concerning the teaching of Emerson. He confessed he had been feeding on Emerson more than on anyone else, but he did not want it known. So, when those on either side of denominational walls venture into the others' area in search of worshipful customs and return with a truth or practice helpful to the spiritual life of their people, they must import it surreptitiously. However, the great majority are pharisaically content with their own methods.

Such enforced restriction of religious sympathies naturally carries a consequent narrowing of spiritual vision. When sects center attention on one facet of the jewel only, what other result is possible? To be sure, one must think of self and work for self, but not for self alone, if one is to be Christian. Condemnation of the politician whose interests are bounded by those of his party, which he places above his country, is proverbial; but wherein lies the superiority of the restricted Christian vision of the thorogoing sectarianist over that of such a politician? Tho one grants that, as society is constituted at present, it is necessary to work thru existing institutional machinery, whether in religion or in politics, and on that basis some things in both which deserve condemnation may be justifiably condoned; yet, to all thinking people, the sectarianist who regards his

denomination as coextensive with the Kingdom of God, so that love for the universal militant church never abides in his soul, is more absurdly ridiculous than is the politician who feels that his party's interests are coextensive with the interests of his country.

If this restricted outlook characterizes the minister there is a reason. It is necessary for him to teach what contra-distinguishes his denomination from all others, else how can he justify his or his people's position? So doctrinal sermons, preached by "simply laying down the straight stick by the crooked", are generally only denominational sermons. However, when the minister's promotion depends upon the success he has in building up his church, and this in turn depends upon his emphasis upon his particular brand of denominationalism, he is caught between the upper and nether millstones of advancement or personal defeat, and one dreads the latter greatly!

Surplus of Church Edifices

Another drawback of divided Protestantism is revealed by the surplus of church edifices forced upon its constituency. The United Lutheran Church in America with its 801,250 adherents, 3,803 edifices, and 210 members per local organization has the highest average membership per church of any denomination. All the others range in averages down to the lowest, 51, possessed by the Cumberland Presbyterian. The 23,514,769 white Protestant population with its 183,505 churches gives an average membership of only 128.

That such an overchurched condition is due to denom-

inationalism cannot be denied. The Roman Catholic church provides 16,615 edifices for 18,104,804 communicants, giving an average of 1,089 members to the church.[1] But it is a unified organization, whereas divided Protestants are compelled to burden themselves with the construction and maintenance of eight times as many edifices to accommodate a corresponding membership. Besides, Protestants[2] furnish 71,574,460 sittings for 26,721,330 adherents, so that if the maximum attendance equals the membership, which is not probable, they have more than two and one-half times as many sittings as are ever used; while the Roman Catholics provide only 7,244,140 sittings for 18,104,804 communicants, almost exactly reversing the ratio. As Dr. Ashworth pointedly comments: "After all allowances are made for differences in modes and conceptions of worship which distinguish Catholics and Protestants, and which permit the former to care for a larger number of worshippers in a single building than is possible to the latter, there is still reason to ask with Mr. Root, whether it would not seem that Protestants are bearing a far larger burden in the maintenance of church equipment than should be necessary." [3]

Someone may say that if the Protestants have supplied a surplus of churches for their own constituency, they have not done so when the entire potential Protestant population is taken into account. The answer will depend of course upon how well one thinks this popula-

[1] Latest available statistics giving communicants, churches, and sittings.

[2] Applies to all Protestants.

[3] *Union of Christian Forces*, p. 26.

tion should be provided for. The facts are these: We have a non-Catholic population of 89,315,069, and a total of 183,505 white Protestant churches. This gives an average of only 587 per edifice, which is decidedly smaller than the average of the Catholic church.[4]

Consequent Financial Burden

Closely related to this nation-wide overchurched condition of Protestantism is the heavy financial burden which rests upon its forces. In 1916, 31,912 Protestant churches carried an aggregate debt of $84,984,081. This is a good percentage of the total valuation of all church property, and an average debt of $2,631 for these particular churches.[5] It is hardly conceivable that either the surplus of buildings or the debt encumbrances would have come about apart from denominationalism, for both have arisen to foster a sectarian Christianity.

Indiscriminate Locating of Churches

However, sectarianism's most glaring defect in this connection is disclosed by its hit and miss method of locating churches in the town and country areas. The most exhaustive investigation to date on this point is that made by the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Using the data collected in the surveys made by the ill-fated Interchurch World Movement, in conjunction with a detailed study of twenty-five counties carried out under its own auspices, the Institute has

[4] Calculated from *Federal Council Year Book 1923*, p. 399.

[5] *U. S. Bulletin* 142, pp. 49–50. To include Catholics would give an average debt of $3,835. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

given us an absolutely reliable report concerning church distribution in the town and country sections of one hundred and seventy-nine counties located in forty-four states.[6] It is a most lamentable condition, too, of which it tells. For instance, taken as a whole, there is a church in these counties for every 463 inhabitants, yet they are so unevenly distributed that in some of them there is a church for every 163 people, in others a church for 11,089 people. Again, if 1,000 inhabitants to a church is taken for a standard, only six counties of the 179 come within a hundred above or below the suggested norm; one hundred and eight counties have more than twice as many churches; and twenty-seven of them have more than four times as many as this standard calls for. On the other hand, seven of these counties have more than three thousand persons for every Protestant church; 55% of them, with a total of 467 town and county communities in which live 7.7% of their population, are without any churches at all. Furthermore, twelve counties with an aggregate country population of 68,674 have no country churches whatsoever, and five counties with an aggregate village population of 19,415 are without village churches of any sort.[7] Moreover, a recent survey of the villages in 140 agricultural communities showed an average of 5.6 churches per village.[8] The villages with four churches

[6] *The Town and Country Church in the United States*, Morse and Brunner, p. 17 f.

[7] The Institute gives the following meaning to these terms: town 2500–5000; village, 250–2500; hamlet, 25–250; country, all remaining under 25. A city is over 5000 population.

[8] *American Agricultural Villages*, p. 175, Brunner, Hughes, and Patten.

each formed the largest group; those with five each the next largest, sixty had seven or more churches each; while two had as many as fifteen apiece. No village of any size had one church only. Investigation of the village and country church situation in the state of Ohio shows a like condition prevailing. In 1,345 townships, wholly or partly made up of open country or towns of less than 2,500 inhabitants, there were 6,642 churches, or five per township with 307 persons to a church. Available data for 5,392 of these churches shows that 3,776 have a membership of not more than 100 each; 2,956 have a membership of not more than seventy-five apiece; and 1,860 have a membership of not more than fifty each.[9]

Before the books containing the above information were published, the present writer, working independently, had gathered some valuable information which bears upon the point in question. Of necessity his material is smaller in volume and more limited as to territory covered than that of the Institute, but he had conceived the need of getting a "bird's-eye view" of this problem in the country as a whole in order to avoid falling into the possible error of generalizing a country-wide situation from a limited personal experience. Wherefore, ten representative states were selected,[10] from which twenty-five towns—ten with 500–1,000, ten with 1,000–2,000 and five with 2,000–3,000 population—were chosen, and to each of them a questionnaire was sent.

[9] Gill and Pinchot, *Six Thousand Country Churches*, pp. 110–111.

[10] Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Mississippi, Kansas, Illinois, Minnesota, California, Washington.

Since, of the 150 replies received, eight were supplied by postmasters, seventy-one by Protestant laymen, fifty-eight by Protestant ministers, and only twelve did not state by whom answered, the information given is regarded as trustworthy.

One impression which a study of these returns gives is this: the distribution of Protestant churches has been made without rhyme or reason. For instance, of the villages with 500–1,000 inhabitants, five with an average population of 601 had one church each; fifteen with an average population of 746 had three churches apiece; eleven with an average population of 801 had four churches each; and eleven with an average population of 795 had each five churches.

The problem of distribution was just as much awry in the towns having 1,000–2,000 inhabitants. For example, one of them with a population of 1,000 reported "we have no church at all"; another exactly the same size reported one church; while another with a population of only 1,441 said eleven denominations, ten of which had church buildings, were located there. Between these two extremes the following distribution prevailed: six towns with an average population of 1,224 had two churches each; fifteen with an average population of 1,502 had three churches apiece; eighteen with an average population of 1,490 had four churches each; nine with an average population of 1,557 had each five churches; six with an average population of 1,658 had five churches apiece; and two towns with an average population of 1,246 had eight churches each.

In the case of the towns having 2,000–3,000 inhabit-

ants the same indiscriminate distribution of local churches was found. Two of them with an average population of 2,523 had one church each; six others with an average population of 2,326 had each three churches; eight more of 2,472 average of population had four churches each; four others with 2,390 average reported five churches each; five others reporting an average of 2,471 also reported six churches apiece; four more with an average population of 2,476 had seven churches each; two others having an average population of 2,724 had eight churches each; another town of 2,298 inhabitants boasted of nine churches, still another with 2,116 people claimed eleven churches, while still one other with 2,381 persons reported thirteen churches present.

On the basis of the above there are at least three inescapable conclusions: For one thing, if such facts do not prove the existence of "over-" and "under-" churched communities, then clearly it is impossible to prove it. What other interpretation is possible, when one community of 1,000 people has no church at all while another with only 1,441 inhabitants has ten? Secondly, if these facts do not show that the Protestant denominations have hitherto left to whim, caprice, chance, and sectarian bigotry and rivalry the task of planting local churches—certainly as far as all the sections surveyed to date are concerned—then what can show it? How else account for one-seventh of the towns and communities comprising 5,039,991 population being without a Protestant church of any sort, or the fact that six towns with an average population of 1,658 have six churches each, while fifteen towns with

1,502 average population (156 fewer people each) have only three churches apiece. Finally, if these facts do not reveal the need for a wiser and more judicial planning for the future in this matter, then what can reveal that need? Moreover, how can it be brought about other than by a close, friendly, and harmonious interdenominational co-operation?

Over-Supply of Ministers

Vitally related to this fault of indiscriminate and, therefore, unwise distribution of its local churches is another blot of a divided Protestantism, namely, that which comes to light in connection with the supply, training, and remuneration of its ministers, together with a frequently enforced inefficiency on the part of both its churches and clergymen. There is a minister to-day for every 150 communicants of the white Protestant population in the United States.[11] If from the total number we deduct a suggested 20%, in order to give a liberal allowance for the superannuated, unemployed, those holding clerical positions, teachers in schools of theology, some on the foreign field tho included in the home list,[12] we should still have only 187 communicants per pastor. The unified Catholics have 1,029 or 824 communicants per priest, depending upon whether the calculation is made respectively after or before the 20% reduction is noted, while the whole non-Catholic population of 89,315,067 supplies

[11] Calculated from table given in 1923 *Federal Council Year Book*, pp. 393–396.

[12] F. Marion Simms, *What Must The Churches Do To Be Saved*, p. 77, and Ashworth in *The Union of Christian Forces*, p. 25.

only 689 persons to each of the 156,744 Protestant clergymen.

Clearly, therefore, the talk so often heard about a shortage in the number of ministers is unfounded. There may be a scarcity of first-class ones, but certainly none when both poor and good are counted. Nevertheless, because of the large number of churches which are either pastorless or are served by part-time resident and non-resident pastors, there does appear to be a scarcity in ministerial supply. For example, in the case of the one hundred and seventy-nine counties,[13] we learn that only 45% of the ministers serve a single church; 25% serve two; 15% serve three; 15% serve four; while 37% of the communities in 159 counties containing 29.2% of the population had no resident pastor. One of these counties did not have a minister within its borders. In Ohio, in the case of open country sections and villages of less than 2,500 inhabitants, 25% of the townships had no churches served by a resident minister; 40% of the villages were without resident ministers; and 11% of 6,642 churches had no regular services of a minister at all.[14] Thus, in the nation there are 808 communities without a single resident pastor, and 16,258 other communities without one full-time resident pastor.[15] Of 585 town and village churches surveyed by the writer, 266 were served by non-resident ministers or were pastorless.

To be sure, all of this seems to indicate that there are

[13] Surveyed by Institute of Social and Religious Research. See Morse and Brunner, *Town and Country Churches in the United States*, Chap. III, for a full discussion of this point.

[14] Gill and Pinchot, *Six Thousand Country Churches*, pp. 113–114.

[15] *Town and Country Churches*, p. 37.

not enough preachers to go around. But that is not so. The situation springs from a sectarianism which has split the Protestant constituency into a number of little, competing churches, few of which can support a pastor alone, while the majority are left to share him with one, two, or three others. That only about one-sixth of the 5,552 churches in the 179 counties had full-time resident pastors; that over one-fifth had only part-time resident ministers; that over one-half were served by non-resident pastors; that slightly over one-tenth had no minister at all, is astounding. It is pathetic in the light of the fact that the Protestant population in these counties numbered 767 persons to each minister. However, it has been proven true that, when the number of people per church is 250 or less, the number of churches per minister has to rise to at least two to support him.[16] So, when Protestants are divided among many sects—which in turn gives rise to so many local congregations with such an inevitably small membership that no one of them can support a pastor—we have completed that vicious circle which gives the appearance of a shortage of ministers, while in reality there is an oversupply.

The Ministers' Salaries

From such conditions the minister's salary could not be expected to be otherwise than surprisingly low. The county surveys show that for the town and country churches it varies between the four salary groups following: $750 to $1,000; $1,001 to $1,250; $1,251 to $1,500; $1,501 to $1,750. The average remuneration given for

[16] *Town and Country Churches*, pp. 50–51.

full-time services is only $999.62, which includes the rental value of the parsonage. The estimated salary for these same churches in the entire nation is $1,150 each, plus $250 allowance for parsonage, which brings the total to only $1,400. The remuneration for town and country ministers in Ohio averaged $857 and free use of parsonage. The writer's survey showed that four hundred village and town churches paid an average salary of only $967. The average salary paid in cities ranging from 25,000 population up, was only $1,768.[17]

To be sure, there are other factors than mere denominationalism which give rise to this meagreness of salary and the wide disparity between the numbers of churches with resident and non-resident ministers. Some of the more important of these are: economic prosperity of a community; its population; the friendly or unfriendly relations existing between the open country and the towns and villages; and the percentage of population comprised within the church's membership. But that the two are in fact an outgrowth of sectarianism is obvious, both on the basis of theory and fact. As regards salary, it stands to reason that the same numerical membership concentrated in, say, three to four local churches giving the same financial support, will be able to pay a larger stipend than when divided among five to ten churches. What is thus supported by the logic of reason facts substantiate. The writer's survey shows an average salary of $1,001 in towns with one to four churches apiece, whereas in those with five to

[17] *U. S. Religious Census* 1916, Part I. Summary and General Tables. Also *Bulletin* 142, pp. 72–73. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

thirteen local organizations this average drops to $842. More impressive still is the Institute's report on 997 united churches.[18] "In comparison with the average salary for the ministers in the town and country areas of the twenty-five counties, which was $1,030 (an allowance of $250 having been made for each minister with free use of a parsonage), the averages for the united churches (no allowance for parsonage being included), were as follows: for denominational united churches, $1,349; for federated churches, $1,615; and for undenominational churches, $1,403. A large majority of the ministers were granted, in addition to their cash salaries, the free use of parsonages." Therefore we see, when Protestants unitedly work and worship in the same local church, whatever else may happen, the pastor's salary is greatly improved.

Likewise, it stands to reason that the percentage of resident full-time, and non-resident part-time, pastorates would rise and fall in proportion to the increase and decrease in number of churches in a community. And again, what the logic of reason supports, facts confirm. The data gathered by the writer show, for instance, that of villages of 500–1,000 population, with one, two, or three churches, 70% had resident ministers, while of the same sized towns, with four to five churches, only 56% had them. Of towns of one to two thousand inhabitants, with one to four churches, 83% had resident ministers; but of the same sized towns where there were five to eight churches, only 63% were so provided. Of towns from two to three thousand population, with one

[18] Elizabeth R. Hooker, *United Churches*, pp. 193–194.

to five churches each, 85% enjoyed resident pastors; but of the same sized towns, with six to thirteen churches, only about 60% had them.

Poorly Trained Ministry

Again, the ministers located in towns and villages are woefully lacking in scholastic training. In one Ohio district nearly one-half of the clergymen of the largest denominations did not have even a common school education; in other sections a considerable proportion had no more than three or four grades of grammar school training; while some could not write their names properly.[19] Of the ministers whose schooling was reported in the writer's questionnaire, only 255 had been to college, only 169 to a seminary, and 171 to neither.

That there is a connection between the number of churches a town has and the schooling of the ministers who serve those churches is proven by two things. First, the larger percentage of the college and seminary trained are in towns with from one to two churches, and second, the percentage of properly trained ministers decreases as the number of churches per town increases—with its disappearance altogether in towns with nine or more churches each.

What a showing for Protestant sectarianism! A study of 140 agricultural communites proved that educated ministers do better work in any situation than the uneducated. Even in communities strongly competitive a trained man produces larger gross results than an un-

[19] Gill and Pinchot, *Six Thousand Country Churches*, p. 23.

trained man in a less competitive field.[20] Yet for the sake of maintaining denominational distinctions, competing churches have to limp along, led by an untrained ministry which is willing to work for the pittance these churches are able to pay. If the pastor of such a church should possess mental capacity and moral stamina for self-training, the meagreness of his pay prohibits the acquisition of a necessary library. In such positions, for aspiring men it is a case of "debt, celibacy, or a rich wife".[21] Of course trained men with such churches have one other avenue of escape—quitting the pastorate entirely. After twenty-five years had passed it was found that twenty-four out of a seminary class of twenty-five had done this—giving as their reason inadequate salaries.[22]

Problem of Resident Ministry

A resident minister is vital to the progress of a local church. In the whole country, the budget for rural churches with full-time pastorates is $3,063.61; with part-time pastorates it is $1,924.69; with non-resident ministers it is $558.89. Forty-five per cent. of the Sunday schools attached to churches with full-time ministers have more than twice as many classes to propose for church membership; three times as many life recruits; three times as many teacher-training classes; one-third again as much missionary education as the 55% which have non-resident ministers.[23] Of all the churches critically studied, three-fourths of those with full-time

[20] Brunner, Hughes and Patten, *American Agricultural Villages*, p. 176.
[21] John R. Mott, *Future Leadership of the Church*, p. 89.
[22] Gill and Pinchot, *The Country Church.*
[23] Morse and Brunner, *Town and Country Churches*, p. 130.

resident pastors are growing; two-thirds of those with part-time resident pastors are growing; while of those with non-residents pastors, only 45% are growing. The most comprehensive survey made to date thus proves that a resident minister is essential to the financial plan as well as amount of contribution, the educational and missionary programs, church attendance, growth in membership—in short, to the progress of the local church in almost every phase of its work. Yet, a rampant denominationalism has brought it about that only 21% of the town and country communities with churches can have full-time pastors, while of 3,353 clergymen serving town and country churches in 179 counties, in order to make a living nearly one-third are compelled to combine some other occupation with the work of the ministry, and, of the total number of 60,127 town- and country-church ministers in the nation, nearly one-third are forced to cumber their ministerial work with some other avocation such as teaching or farming.[24] It does seem that for points of denominational distinction American Protestants hold a deeper love than for either the efficiency of the church, or the progress of the Kingdom of God.

Church Quarters

Again, the efficiency of Protestant churches is seriously hindered, especially in the town and country sections (tho the same applies to cities in a degree), because of inadequate quarters for either educational or young people's work. The majority of country church- and a

[24] Morse and Brunner, *Town and Country Churches in the United States*, p. 41.

large per centage of village and town church-buildings are nothing more than consecrated one-room barns. Neither in architecture nor facilities are they conducive either to the spirit of reverent worship or to the desire to project a program of activities. Such important items as class rooms with boards and maps; or gymnasiums for recreation purposes, are wholly lacking. This condition cannot be laid entirely to a lingering dislike of beauty in buildings, inherent since the Reformation Era, nor to lack of desire for more efficient church plants demanded by modern-day life: it arises, rather, from the financial incapacity of a divided Protestantism. For example, of towns with 500–1,000 inhabitants having one church, the building is valued at $9,500; with two churches, the average value is $12,500; with three, the average is $10,000; with four, it is $5,500; and with five, only $4,500. Church buildings in towns with 1,000–2,000 population average, when there are two, $10,400; when three, $10,000; when four, $7,650; when five, $8,000; when six, $6,000; when eight, $3,800; when eleven, $2,200. In towns of 2,000–3000 inhabitants having three churches, their average value is $9,500; with four, it is $10,000; with five, it is $11,500; with six and seven, it is $8,000; with eight, it is $3,700; with nine, it is $1,100; with eleven, it is $5,000.[25] These figures show that the larger the number of churches the less value they carry. Is there ground for doubting that, likewise, there is a minimum of equipment?

Then, as at present organized, the town and country churches have one church in every four (according to

[25] Author's *Questionnaire.*

the Federal Census of 1916), or one out of every five (according to the survey of 68 counties made by the Institute),[26] without any Sunday school organizations: or, as estimated for the nation from ratios set up on the basis of actual surveys of 179 counties, only 88% of town churches; 89% of village churches; and 67% of country churches have them.[27] Even of the Sunday schools in existence, the present enrollment leaves much to be desired: the average for town schools is 148; for village schools is 95; and for open country schools, 58. Furthermore, of those enrolled, only 70, 63, and 66% attend in town, village, and country, respectively. Only 80% of these Sunday schools keep open for fifty-two Sundays in the year; leaving 20% to hibernate during the winter. Again, one-fourth of them meet in one and two rooms; the graded system is lacking in a large number; while such aids as sand tables, maps, attractive decorations, stereopticons, etc., are chiefly noticeable thru their absence. Their teaching force, because wholly made up of volunteers, necessarily is characterized more by its willingness than by its fitness, for, as Dr. Athearn affirms, the assets of the average Sunday school teacher are; "a certain amount of loyalty, piety, consecration and a lesson quarterly." [28]

Church Program

Once more, in the case of 1,047 country churches surveyed, it was discovered that they fell into two main divisions with respect to their program: one group had

[26] Morse and Brunner, *Town and Country Churches*, p. 123.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[28] *Ibid.*, quoted, p. 127.

a minimum program of one preaching service per month; the other group provided for from one to eight preaching services a month, a Sunday school and woman's missionary society—but for little or nothing else. Only 55% of them had any form of woman's organizations, and only 35% had any form of young people's societies. Of these having the latter, three-fourths were for older young people, the remainder for boys and girls. Thirty-nine of these churches had purely boys' organizations, and fifty-six had only clubs for girls.[29] In seventy counties surveyed in the southern states, other than the Sunday school, only fifty-eight young people's organizations were found.[30]

At best, and from any point of view, such facts are appalling. Touching Sunday schools, they reveal a deplorable situation as to their numbers, quarters, and the quality of work done. As regards a church program, there is none of commanding importance, and their neglect of young people is tragic. All this, too, despite the fact that churches with three rooms or more better the record of those with one and two rooms, by from one-half to three times on all items connected with religious education; that in the communities where 1,047 churches were located, there were found 655 organizations for men and 300 for women, but only 30 boys' and girls' clubs not under the auspices of the church, thus showing that non-religious forces are not providing for young people; and that churches which do provide religious and social organizations for their young people

[29] *Town and Country Churches*, pp. 160–168.
[30] Brunner, *The Church in the Rural South*, p. 75.

show a record of accessions which is 29% better than the record of churches without. It has been well said: "The average village community considers itself apart from its young people, is quite often ashamed of them, does not understand them, and lays the blame for young people's restlessness to the jazz band and automobile instead of facing the charge of negligence and lack of sympathetic understanding in its own method of living." [31]

That sectarianism is in large part to blame for this condition is patent. A church program of real activities in addition to adequate physical equipment requires the service of educational directors and young people's workers, as well as well-trained ministers for full-time resident pastorates. In turn, all of these call naturally for an additional outlay of expense. But divided among a number of little churches, the membership of no one of which single-handed can supply the money, Protestants stand impotent in the face of great opportunities.

With its indiscriminate distribution of local churches; frequent part-time resident and non-resident pastorates; inadequate salaries; untrained ministry; out-moded facilities; lack of proper program; consequent neglect of young people; and restricted vision; had it tried, apparently Protestantism could hardly have given rise to a church life shot thru with more points of enforced inefficiency than the one denominationalism has supplied.

Proposed Remedies

Obviously, some remedy is needed to correct these faults. One frequently suggested means of supplying

[31] Quoted in *American Agricultural Villages*, p. 214.

resident pastors to churches which are unable single-handed to afford them is that of uniting such churches of one denomination into a co-ordinated field. While this procedure may be an important step in the curative process, it is far from competent to solve the problem. It but serves to bring together the scattered churches of any sect into a single parish, often still so large a minister can scarcely cover it frequently enough to do the necessary work, so that, practically speaking, only the church nearest to where the minister lives has a resident pastor. Besides, the church buildings still remain one-room affairs, with inadequate equipment. The Methodist Episcopal churches (both North and South) have always had such circuits as an essential feature of their denominational program, yet, in the Ohio state survey it was found that a large percentage of the rural churches of the Northern Methodists were compelled to share their pastors with from two to four churches each.

Again, we are often told that to remedy the evils of the existing church order—to supply resident pastors, proper equipment, and a worthy program to all local churches—the only thing needed is to win all the population to its support. That this is an ill-founded belief is evident. On the one hand, the hope of reaching *all* the population for the Christian church is an ideal, which, tho worthy, appears quite impossible of attainment—at least under present organized church life it is far from realization. Of the 179 counties surveyed, only one had around 50% of the county population enrolled, eight only had as much as 50%, while the highest percentage of village population enrolled was

90%.[32] On the other hand, to grant that this ideal could be reached, it would mean (calculated on the basis of the nation's potential Protestant population) an average of only 412 for each existing church—and that would not solve the problem, for two reasons. First, the churches are not located so as to be reached by all the people, and second, other factors than a numerical membership comprise a church's ability to function properly.

Interdenominational Co-operation the Cure

After all, what convinces is not an untried theory, but a means which has been tested and found workable. On that basis (tho organic union of Protestants, which of course would solve the problem, is held to be impossible), these faults can be overcome thru an interdenominational co-operation or federation. This is amply proven in communities which have practiced it.

For example, there was the town of Ontario, Richland County, Ohio, with three churches—Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, and Methodist Episcopal. From 1900, down to the time of uniting their strength, neither of the Presbyterian churches had had any regular services. The Methodist church shared its minister with three or four other churches, but in 1912 no resident minister had been in the town for three years. In 1915 these churches got together, at least the Christian people of the community did. Money was pledged for the support of a full-time minister. The pastor was settled there in 1915. The first year $1,540 was raised for all purposes; the second year the budget was $7,500—and

[32] Morse and Brunner, *Town and Country Churches*, p. 63.

raised, and other results were—the moral tone of the community improved, churches saved to the Christian cause, and missionary giving increased.

Or take the case of Centerton, a little country community of northwest Arkansas. It had a little denominational church belonging to the Methodist Episcopal church (South). Two years ago it was weak, had no adequate program, no systematic finance, and poor attendance. To-day 75 men and boys are organized in an athletic club, there is a Pollyanna club for girls, Boy Scouts, a Ladies Aid society of 42 members, the Sunday school has a seventeen-piece orchestra, study groups and teacher-training classes are held regularly. What brought this change? A live-wire resident pastor working on a community basis rather than that of a purely denominational foundation. People of the community not members of the community church support it.[33]

There is no lack of concrete instances of the sort.[34] As a matter of fact, there are somewhere between 1,000–1,500 such churches in the nation—and the number is growing yearly.[35] But wherever they are, whether in the town, village, or country sections, invariably we find the Christian people of the different denominations co-operating, federating, or actually uniting.

[33] *Church Life in the Rural South*, pp. 77–78.

[34] *Six Thousand Country Churches*, pp. 31–83; and twelve more in *Churches of Distinction in Town and Country*, two of which are especially to the point here, pp. 27–41 and pp. 160–170.

[35] See Chapter VIII, where these churches are treated separately.

PART II

INTERDENOMINATIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES; ITS PROBLEM AND PROGRESS

CHAPTER VI

CO-OPERATION AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF DENOMINATIONS AMONG THE STATES

Sects per State

We have traversed the field of the rise of the white Protestant denominations in the United States and considered some of the principal causes which led to their sectarian divisions, together with some consequent advantages and disadvantages. Our task now is to study the facts relating to the distribution of these denominations in the several states and to judge as to their relative strength and influence, in so far as this can be done from statistical reports, to see if there may be any relationship between these facts and the problem of denominational co-operation.

There is a very wide divergence in the number of denominations found in the different states. To name the states [1] according to the number of white denominations present in them, arranged in a descending scale, we have: Illinois leading with ninety-eight; Ohio running a close second with ninety-six; Pennsylvania next with ninety-five; Michigan not far behind with eighty-eight; Indiana claiming eighty-seven; Kansas and Iowa each possessing eighty-one; Missouri supporting seventy-one; Wisconsin having sixty-eight; Nebraska claiming sixty-seven; Min-

[1] Worked out from *U. S. Religious Census*, 1916, Vol. II. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

nesota with sixty-six; Washington with sixty-five; Oklahoma having sixty-four; Virginia, New Jersey, and West Virginia with an even sixty apiece; Oregon having fifty-eight; Maryland and Kentucky boasting of fifty-seven each; Texas holding fifty-five; Tennessee and Colorado each with fifty-four; Massachusetts with fifty-three; South Dakota and North Carolina with forty-eight apiece; Alabama and North Dakota claiming each forty-seven; Florida possessing forty-six; Georgia, Idaho, and Connecticut with forty-four each; Arkansas claiming forty-three; Montana holding forty-two; the District of Columbia boasting of forty-one; Wyoming claiming thirty-nine; Mississippi with thirty-seven; Rhode Island having thirty-six; Maine claiming thirty-four; Louisiana possessing thirty-three; South Carolina boasting of thirty-two; Delaware having twenty-nine; New Hampshire requiring twenty-seven; Arizona and New Mexico possessing twenty-six apiece; Vermont holding twenty-three; Utah claiming nineteen, and Nevada closing the list with eleven. Thus we see that there are seven states with eighty or more white Protestant denominations; eighteen states with from fifty to seventy-five; twenty-one states with from twenty-five to fifty, and only three states with fewer than twenty-five. All of the states having above eighty denominations are in the northern and middle west section of the country.[2] Of the eighteen states [3] having from fifty to seventy-five

[2] Ill., Ohio, Pa., Mich., Ind., Kansas and Iowa.

[3] North—Mass., Ky., W. Va., N. J., N. Y.
North Central—Mo., Wis., Minn., Neb.
Western—Colo., Ore., Wash., Cal.
Southern—Tenn., Texas, Md., Va., Okla.

denominations, five are northern, four are north central, four are western, and five are southern. Of the twenty-one [4] states with from twenty-five to fifty denominations each, two are north central, five are western, six are northern and eight are southern, while of the three states [5] which have less than twenty-five Protestant divisions each, two are situated in the southwestern and one in the northeastern sections of the country.

Area Covered by Denominations

Moreover, when we analyze the distribution of the denominations among the states with a view to determine the number of states in which each one is represented, we find that of the one hundred fifty-three white Protestant divisions with which we are dealing, only six—the Seventh-Day Adventists, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Protestant Episcopal, the Salvation Army, and the Church of Christ Scientist—are to be found in every state in the union.[6] To be sure there are several other denominations which very nearly reach into every state. For instance, the Congregationalists are lacking only in Delaware, the Disciples of Christ are missing only in Nevada and New Hampshire, the United Lutheran Church extends into all the states save Louisi-

[4] North Central—N. D., S. D.
Western—N. M., Ariz., Wyo., Mont., Idaho.
Northern—N. H., Del., Maine, R. I., D. C., Conn.
Southern—S. C., La., Miss., Ark., Ga., Fla., Ala., N. C.
[5] South Western—Utah, Nev.
North Eastern—Vt.
[6] Including the District of Columbia.

ana and Arkansas, while the Synodical Conference of Lutherans covers all the country save Delaware and Vermont. Furthermore, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints we find in forty-six states, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene goes into forty-five, while a group of churches listed under the title "Independent Churches" extends over forty-three states. Then too, there are certain family denominational groups which cover the entire country, as, for instance, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Methodist family groups.[7] The Northern Baptists are represented in thirty-five while the Southern Baptists are present in twenty states. These two taken together more than cover the country. As a matter of fact, there are six states in which both of them are present. But this situation has arisen from the fact that certain churches have selected the one or the other of these bodies to be their ecclesiastical connection, rather than from a keen denominational rivalry expressed in missionary work. It is greatly to the credit of the Northern and Southern Baptists that the overlapping of their territories has been reduced to a minimum. As much cannot be said in regard to the Presbyterians, the northern branch of which carries on work in all of the eighteen states in which the southern branch is represented; nor of the Methodists, when the Methodist Episcopal church (North) is found in all of the states in which the Methodist Episcopal church (South) is represented.

For the sake of convenience to consider the District

[7] Exclusive of the members of this group named in the list of six denominations covering the entire country.

of Columbia as a state, the facts relative to the distribution of the one hundred fifty-three white Protestant denominations among the states are as follows: six denominations reach into every state and the District of Columbia; eight others extend into from forty-seven to forty states; one into thirty-nine; three into thirty-eight states; six denominations extend into thirty-six states each; two others cover thirty-five each; another extends over thirty-four; still another covers thirty-three; two others reach into thirty-two; four others cover each thirty-one; two extend into thirty; three into twenty-nine; one into twenty-six; two into twenty-four; three into twenty-three each; three others into twenty-two apiece; three more cover twenty-one each; six others extend into exactly twenty each; two cover nineteen states each; three others eighteen each; five others spread over seventeen states each; one covers sixteen; two more extend over fifteen; three more over fourteen each; two each over thirteen; seven more reach into twelve states each, and eight others into eleven states each. Of those denominations which are represented in as few as ten states and less we find: five cover ten states each; one spreads over nine; eight over eight each; four over seven states each; eight others reach into six states each; three more into five; six into four states; five into three each; eight extend over only two states apiece; while fifteen sects limit their influence to one state each.

For the sake of brevity we may group the states by ten, count on a descending scale and find the following to be true: fourteen denominations reach into forty to

forty-nine states; twenty-two reach into thirty-nine states; twenty-one cover from twenty to twenty-nine states; thirty-eight spread over ten to nineteen states; forty-three are found in from two to nine states; while fifteen sects limit the territory of their labors to one state each.

No State Has Full Gospel

There follows from the above facts one rather important inference. It is this: When we couple the fact that there is no state in the Union which contains in an organized form representatives of all the one hundred and fifty-three white Protestant denominations, with the fact that there are one hundred and forty-seven sectarian divisions which fail to reach into every state, either the claim sometimes made, that each sect has arisen to advocate and perpetuate an essential Christian doctrine which others have failed to emphasize, is greatly weakened, or else we have to think of the larger majority of our states at present trudging along the religious highway devoid of some important Christian tenet. We cannot escape that conclusion because, on the assumption that each Protestant sect propagates some essential Christian doctrine which all the other denominations lack, wherever there exists a section of the country in which any one of the Protestant divisions is absent, that area lacks the fullness of the gospel message. Indeed if that assumption be true, there is no state in the union which has the blessing of the full-orbed, well-rounded Christian gospel. Illinois with its ninety-eight Protestant divisions would come nearer

to it than any other, tho it would still be lacking in a full one-third part of what is essential. And what shall we say of Nevada? With only eleven denominations, it can lay claim to about one-tenth part of the gospel truth. Then trail all the other forty-seven states [8] in between these two, with their greatest and smallest number of sectarian divisions, and each has an imperfect, incomplete, and partial system of Christian doctrine. Of course upon the face of it such a claim is absurd; it is stated to help show to others its absurdity from an angle ordinarily overlooked, namely, that of statistical facts. One may wish that each denomination in existence might have a positive contribution to make to the full-rounded truth of the Christian faith, and one may go so far as to believe it true; but not without doing violence to the facts as presented here.

Relative Influence of Denominations

The above study of the distribution of the Protestant denominations among the states raises a second point of importance. On the basis of influence exerted it may sound well to say that a denomination covers many states, while from the same standpoint it may sound bad to say we have denominations which are confined to one state each. But, as a matter of fact, the area over which a denomination extends is not always a true index as to its size or possible influence. It is not always the smallest sect which is limited to one state or even to two or three states. For instance, there is one division of the Mennonites with eight hundred members

[8] To include the District of Columbia.

scattered over six states; whereas the Schwenkfelders, with over eleven hundred members locate all their six local organizations in the state of Pennsylvania. Plymouth Brethren IV. report thirteen hundred and eighty-nine members spread over thirty-nine states, making an average of about forty-eight to the state; whereas not one of the fifteen sects limited to a state apiece makes such a small showing. Other comparisons like these could be made, but they would prove more interesting than valuable to the point at hand. Suffice it to say, that of the thirty-six Protestant sects reporting less than one thousand each, four extend over from ten to twelve states; ten cover from six to nine states; while twenty-two spread into from one to five states. It is easily seen that the influence of such scattered remnants of Christian sects must be practically nil. What great power for good can a group of Christians be—it matters not what special doctrinal theory it holds so pricelessly dear as to compel its severance from other Christian groups—if it comprises less than one thousand members scattered among a population of twenty millions?

Small Sects Grow as Well as Large

If the reply is made "That is just the point! Why lay such stress upon these little denominations? They are small and will remain so because of special peculiarities belonging to them", the answer is: As phenomena of American denominationalism they are as worthy of discussion as any others, for they are manifesting as vigorous a life as many sects numerically much larger. As a matter of fact, of those thirty-six

sects, each with fewer than one thousand members, during the ten years, 1906–1916 (U. S. Religious Census), twelve held their own or came into being, only eight suffered a decrease in membership, and sixteen enjoyed from 5% to 100% increase. Of the eighty-two denominations having from one thousand to fifty thousand members, during the same ten years, fourteen managed to hold their own, forty-eight enjoyed from 5% to 50% increase, but twenty of them suffered loss. The general showing for these two groups of denominations is sufficient to prove that we cannot ignore these numerous sects because they are small. We may deplore their presence and wish them to disband and join larger and more influential divisions, but they all carry the hope and belief that they will win out in the end. Not without some show of reason either, for when we add to the groups of denominations just named the thirty-five additional Protestant divisions which have a membership of above fifty thousand, we find that during the same ten years only twenty-nine enjoyed an increase, while six suffered numerical loss. Thus although the percentage of losing denominations is greater among those of the smallest membership, we see that even the largest ones in many instances failed to be blessed with an increased membership. The point is that this spirit of sectarianism is as much justified in the case of the smaller sects as the larger ones. Moreover, if the smaller ones are uninfluential because of their size, or are to be ridiculed because they are present in so many states in such insignificant numbers, can they not truthfully retort that the same facts apply to the numerically large

denominations? For a careful analysis of the distribution of the Protestant sects among the states reveals the fact that there are one hundred and eighteen of them with from three to two organizations in a state, while still another one hundred and eighteen of them are represented each by just one organization in a state.[9] As a matter of fact, there are sixty-two denominations which are represented by from one to three organizations only, in over one-half of the states in which they are present. Some of these present a very pitiful spectacle. For instance, the Seventh-Day Baptists extend into twenty states, but have only one to three organizations in fifteen of them. Surely this sect cannot be of any great influence in those states. Or again, the Plymouth Brethren IV reach into twenty-nine states, but in twenty-one of them have only from one to three organizations. The absurd extreme to which distribution may go is shown in the case of the Metropolitan Church Association, which reports its presence in seven states by only one organization in each. Nor is this situation limited to the so-called unimportant sects. There are only eighteen denominations which do not have as few as two or three organizations in some one or more of the states in which they are represented. Nor do we find among these eighteen some denominations which we might expect or hope to find. For instance, the Methodist Episcopal Church (South) is not in this list, for there are three states in each of which it has only two or three churches. Neither the Presbyterian Church (North) nor the Presbyterian Church (South) can

[9] These two groups include 135 denominations.

be included in this list, for each of them is represented in one state each by only two or three churches. Of the entire group of Lutheran divisions only one—the United Lutheran Church—can be included, for all the others are represented in from one to seven states each by only one to three churches. Nor can we place either the Northern Baptists or the Southern Baptists in this list, because each of these conventions has in one state only one to two churches.

So the point raised above concerning the influence of a denomination in a state where it has a minimum of one to three churches is not unimportant. This applies to all but eighteen of the one hundred and fifty-three white Protestant divisions, a fact which must help one to appreciate more fully the unreasonable extremes to which the sectarian spirit has taken us. Does it not afford a window thru which may be glimpsed the wisdom of curbing the denominational and sectarian tendencies of our country? When a Protestant division reports its presence in a state and the facts show that its number there is only one hundred and fifty, is it unreasonable to say that these few sectarianists might find a place for themselves in some one of the larger denominations? If that were done, small as the step may seem, it would affect one hundred and eighteen denominations, causing them to begin a process of interdenominational relationship which might lead in time to something really significant.

States Showing Preference for Certain Sects

A third item of interest is that several states show a decided preference for certain denominations. Con-

sidering this point only, and limiting it to the white Protestant denominations, the facts are the following: The Baptists (South) lead by a considerable margin over any other denomination in Alabama; Arkansas favors Southern Baptists and Methodists in about equal numbers (113,192 and 110,993 respectively); Delaware is predominately Methodist; Georgia gives first place to the Baptists with the Methodists not far behind; Indiana gives the Methodists (North) a large majority, almost one-third of the Protestant population; so also Iowa and Kansas. The Baptists lead by a considerable margin in Kentucky, as they do also in Maine, tho the Methodist Episcopal (North) is not very far behind. Maryland gives the preference to Methodists, who number about one-third of all its Protestant population; Congregationalists lead in Massachusetts by a good majority; the Methodists in Michigan; the Lutherans in Minnesota by two-thirds; the Baptists lead in Mississippi and likewise in Missouri; the Methodists in Nebraska by a third; the Congregationalists lead in New Hampshire; the Methodists in New Jersey and New York; the Baptists in North Carolina by a half, as do the Lutherans in North Dakota by a half; the Methodists lead in Ohio; Oklahoma divides first place with the Baptists and the Methodists, each having between 90,000 and 100,000; Pennsylvania gives the Presbyterians, Methodist Episcopal (North), and Reformed the lead; the race is about even (20,000 each) between the Episcopalians and the Baptists in Rhode Island; the Lutherans lead in South Dakota; and the Baptists in South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. In Utah the Mormons are supreme—257,719

of them as against 10,000 Protestants of all other denominations. The Congregationalists have practically a draw in Vermont with the Methodists; the Baptists and Methodist Episcopal (South) lead in Virginia by one-half; Washington gives the lead to the Methodists; so does West Virginia; while the Lutherans have about one-half of the Protestant population in Wisconsin.

In other states the Protestant Christians are more evenly distributed among several of the Protestant denominations. Nebraska has four denominations that are very nearly equalized—Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, Presbyterian (North). One of them, the Baptists, the smallest in the four, has 19,643 members. The largest of the four, the Presbyterian, has 26,253. The largest membership in the state, ranging from 50,000 to 75,000,[10] is in the Lutheran (all bodies) and Methodist Episcopal denominations. Michigan presents a still more interesting study. Of seven denominations, the smallest, Disciples of Christ, has 12,740, and the largest, the Methodist Episcopal, has only 144,094. The intervening five are: Protestant Episcopal 33,409; Congregationalist 35,597; Presbyterian (Northern) 48,989; Baptist 49,766; Lutheran about 116,000. No two of the seven are twice as great as the others combined. In California four denominations are on practically a numerical equality: the Protestant Episcopal has 30,018; the Congregational 34,180; Disciples of Christ 32,211; Baptist 39,570; while in the state the greatest discrepancy between the important Protestant bodies is found in the case of the Lutheran,

[10] *Federal Council Year Book*, 1917.

with 18,000,[11] and the Methodist Episcopal, with 98,000. Again no two denominations outnumber the other by half in this group. Iowa is another example of those states in which there is a more even distribution among the denominations. The four denominations of which this is most nearly true are the Congregationalist, 39,524; the Baptist, 44,939; Presbyterian (North), 59,311; and the Disciples of Christ, 73,237. The Lutheran has 9,000,[12] the United Brethren 12,672, and the Protestant Episcopal 8,126. The Methodist leads with 199,036, altho its majority does not give it a preponderant advantage. The state furnishing the best example of the equality of several denominations is Oregon. Here we have, arranged in ascending scale, Protestant Episcopal with 5,726; Congregationalist with 6,373; Lutheran with 8,000; the Disciples of Christ with 15,299; Baptist with 15,635; Presbyterian (North) with 16,672; and Methodist with 27,866. These are sufficient to show that no one or even two denominations are so far in the lead as to give them a pre-eminent numerical authority. The same facts apply in general to New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Illinois and others.[13]

Influence on Co-operation

Some important observations follow from these facts. First, they explain in part why the emphasis upon denominational co-operation and federation is stronger in

[11] Approximate.

[12] Approximate.

[13] All the above statistics are taken from the *Federal Council Year Book*, 1917, pages 220–22, and *U. S. Religious Census*, 1916. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

some sections of the country than in others. In those states where the denomination has the decided lead, or even where two have the preponderant majority, the sentiment among these bodies for local federation and interdenominational co-operation is not as strong as where several denominations are on practically an equality in point of numbers. That this generalization is true will become more evident as the following pages are read. For the present, reference to facts revealed by a questionnaire employed by the writer will be of help.

A Questionnaire

This questionnaire was sent to twenty-five towns in each of ten widely distributed states. In each of these ten towns ranging in population from 500 to 1,000, ten from 1,000 to 2,000, and five from 2,000 to 3,000 were chosen. The towns were selected only with a view of covering the state well. The questionnaire was sent to the postmaster with the request that, if unable to answer the questions himself, he should hand them to a local pastor wherever practicable, otherwise to some other responsible person. Of the seventy-five questionnaires sent to the southern states of Virginia, North Carolina, and Mississippi, forty-six replies were received; twelve from Virginia, eighteen from North Carolina, and sixteen from Mississippi. One question was, "What do you think of church union or federation, as it applies or would apply to your town?" There were twelve replies from Virginia to this question; eleven from North Carolina and seven who passed it by; ten from Mississippi and

six who passed it by, giving a total of thirty-three out of forty-six who answered the question. The following results are obtained from the answers. Of the twelve from Virginia four were for it, three against any form of church union or federation, three doubtful as to its application, and two ignorant of the subject. Of the four who favored it two were Baptist laymen, one a Presbyterian minister, and one a Methodist minister; all three opponents of it were Baptist ministers. The three doubtful as to its application were laymen belonging to the Lutheran, Episcopal, and Baptist denominations. The two claiming ignorance were laymen, one a Baptist, one a Presbyterian. Of the eleven answers from North Carolina only one, a Baptist layman, approved; six opposed it, four Baptist laymen, two Baptist ministers. Of the ten answers received from Mississippi, three, by a Baptist minister, a Methodist minister, and a Methodist layman, were favorable. Six opposed it, three Baptist ministers, two Methodist laymen, one whose denominational connection was unknown. One, a Methodist minister, was doubtful. To summarise from the three states then—there were eight for, fifteen against, four doubtful, and six claiming ignorance. It is interesting to note that four ministers were for it, ten against it—all of them Baptists. In almost every instance where the minister was against interdenominational federation he was pastor of the church with the largest membership in the town. For instance, one pastor who stated that the matter of federation or interdenominational comity was "not an open question" was pastor in a town of 1,443 population, in which there were five churches—Baptist,

with a membership of 443, Methodist, with 23, Episcopalian 7, Presbyterian 7, Christian 1. Another, from another state, referring to the matter of federation in his town, said, "there is no need for it", and it is fairly certain that one of the causes which led him to this conclusion was that his church had as many members as the other three churches of the town combined, and his salary was one-third larger than the salary of any other minister there.

Of the towns in northern states, Massachusetts, New York, and Minnesota, to which the questionnaire was sent, sixteen replies were received from Massachusetts, nineteen from New York, and nine from Minnesota, making a total of forty-four out of the seventy-five questionnaires. Eleven from Massachusetts answered the question, "What do you think of church union or federation as it applies or would apply to your town?" favorably, seven of them ministers (six Congregationalists, one Baptist), and four laymen. One was doubtful—the denominational connection in this instance not indicated. Four of the nine replies from Minnesota were favorable to this question; three from ministers (two Presbyterians, one a Methodist Episcopal); two were against it, both of them from Presbyterians, one a minister; one, a Baptist, was indifferent to the movement. Fifteen of the replies from New York answered the question thus: twelve favored it, seven from ministers (three Methodists and one each from the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Protestant Episcopal churches), and five from laymen; three were against it, two Baptist ministers, one a Methodist layman.

These returns show that the disposition favorable to union in these states is greatly ahead of that in the south. This, no doubt, arises from two causes; first, the practice of federation and co-operation has been in progress in them a longer time; and second, the denominations of these towns are more nearly evenly divided.

To be sure, the need of federation and co-operation is not so pronounced from the point of view of those denominations that control. For instance, in the state of Virginia, the Southern Baptists have 170,151 and the Southern Methodists have 202,048 members, making a total for the two bodies of 372,199 communicants. The total Protestant population of the state in 1916 was 619,145. Thus we see that these two denominations preponderate in that state, certainly as far as numbers are concerned. Why should these two denominations clamor for co-operation and federation? Indeed, why should they care to encourage it? There are only 246,946 Protestants in the state exclusive of them and when we subtract the 82,779 which belong to the Presbyterian church (South) and the Episcopal, we have the remaining Protestant population of the state, 164,217, divided among fifty-seven other Protestant sects, making an average of 2,920. What is true of Virginia is true also of North Carolina and Mississippi. In the former state there are 279,112 Southern Baptists and 226,148 Methodists (South and North), a total of 505,260 communicants out of the total white Protestant population of 766,704, which leaves over and above the Methodists and Baptists only 160,942. Again, subtracting 76,381, the membership of the Presbyterian (South) and the

Protestant Episcopal, we find there are only 84,561 white Protestants remaining. There are forty-three other Protestant divisions in the state having, therefore, an average of only 1,966. In the latter state, Mississippi, the Southern Baptists have 153,497 and the Southern Methodists 114,469, giving to them a total of 267,966 out of a total white Protestant population of 373,616, which leaves only 105,650 Protestants remaining. Again, to subtract from this number the 25,890 which belong to the Presbyterian (South) and the Protestant Episcopal we find there are 79,760. These, when divided equally between the other thirty-three sects in the state, give each a membership of about 2,416. The entire group of southern states would show the same results. In the fifteen southern states [14] there are approximately 9,000,000 white Protestants, and basing the calculations on the same principle used in the above specific instances, approximately six millions of those belong to the Baptist and the Methodist churches.[15]

There is no other group of fifteen states in close proximity of which it can be said that two-thirds of their white Protestant population belong to any two Protestant denominations. Taking as particular instances those northern states to which the questionnaire applied, we find that in New York, while the Methodist Episcopal church with 328,250 and the Presbyterian (North) [16] with 222,888 have a good lead over any

[14] Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Md., Miss., Mo., N. C., S. C., Okla., Tenn., Texas, Va.

[15] All of above calculation made on basis of *U. S. Religious Census* of 1916. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

[16] The two having largest membership.

other two denominations, five others, the Baptist, Congregationalist, Disciples of Christ, Lutheran (all bodies), and the Protestant Episcopal, have a total of 561,267, which very nearly balances the total of the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian (North), while it leaves from the grand total of Protestant Christians another 392,447.

Taking the state of Massachusetts, we find that while the total, 220,060, of the two largest Protestant bodies, Baptist and Congregationalist, is more than the total, 98,264, of the other five denominations considered in this average, yet the Catholics in the state, with over 500,000 lead of all Protestant bodies, create a situation that calls for unity of work among the Protestants. The state of Minnesota, like the southern states, is not progressive in federation and denominational co-operation, the Lutheran bodies totaling 258,516 against 163,000 as a total for the five other leading divisions. Grouping twelve northern states [17] we find it difficult to show the truth of the contention here, since there are no two denominations running systematically thru all the states and embracing three-fourths of all the Protestants, as is true of the Methodists and Baptists in the south. It is likewise true that in all states where there are several denominations on practically an equal numerical basis there is a strong tendency for denominational co-operation.

Again, in the states where a few denominations predominate, a relatively small number of Protestants belong to the larger number of the sectarian divisions.

[17] Me., N. H., Vt., Conn., R. I., N. Y., N. J., Pa., Ohio, Ind., Ill., Del.

In New York the total Protestant population is about one-and-a-half millions.[18] Of this number 1,270,381 belong to sixteen denominations,[19] leaving 229,719 to be divided between fifty-eight other Protestant sects, giving to each of them an average of only about three thousand nine hundred and sixty. In Illinois there are 1,001,922 Protestants in the same sixteen leading denominations, while the entire Protestant population of the state is 1,220,740, leaving 218,818 Protestants to be divided among eighty-three other bodies, thus giving to each about two thousand six hundred and sixty. These absurdly small averages will be found to apply to every state in the union. The Protestant forces are consolidated in all the states in a few denominations, and in the case of the southern states in two, leaving the other Protestant bodies with so few members that they are of little value in so far as their influence and power as a religious force depend upon numbers. The writer realizes, however, that, in the case of the southern states where emphasis has been placed upon the predominance in numbers of the Methodists and Baptists as partially responsible for the local opposition to denominational co-operation, too much may be made of the fact. The Episcopal and Presbyterian churches while small in size have been and are among the most influential denominations in so far as Christianity has influenced the life of the south. These two bodies are living examples of the principle that quality and not

[18] Estimated from *U. S. Census*, 1916, and *Federal Council Year Book*, 1917. For 1926 Census, see Addenda, pp. 329–343.

[19] See *Federal Council Year Book*, 1917, pp. 220–22.

quantity is to be desired when good and lasting work is to be done. While the influence of these two denominations seems out of all proportion to their numbers when compared with the Methodist and Baptist, the fact remains that we have two denominations opposed to local federation, etc., and these almost always the leading churches in the town in point of numbers.

One-Half of Protestants in Ten Per Cent. of Sects

Only one further point needs to be touched upon here. It must be remembered that while we have one hundred and fifty-three denominations in the country, the larger majority of Protestants are comprised within the following fourteen: Baptist (North); Baptist (South); Congregationalist; Disciples of Christ; Methodist Episcopal (North); Methodist Episcopal (South); Presbyterian (North and South); United Presbyterian; Cumberland Presbyterian; Protestant Episcopal; Reformed in America; Reformed in the U. S.; and the United Brethren in Christ. Of the forty million and more Protestant Christians in the country these fourteen bodies embrace about 20,000,000, or, in other words, over half of all Protestant Christians belong to ten per cent. of the Protestant divisions, leaving less than one-half to belong to the remaining nine-tenths of all the denominations.

Upon the surface this would indicate that the pathway of denominational co-operation would be made thereby more smooth. But this is only apparent. As has been shown, when denominations are large and dominant they do not incline too readily toward federa-

tion, for the reason that they are strong enough alone to wield a satisfactory influence. On the other hand, sects which are numerically small possess an intense individualistic spirit and, generally speaking, a strong fear of losing their peculiar identity. A small Christian group is pretty sure to possess a deep sectarian conviction. If this conviction is one of long standing its hold has grown stronger with the passing years; if it is newly formed it has been born and nurtured in an unshaken assurance of its own rightness. Whichever horn of the dilemma one may seize, he is confronted with a tenacious sectarian spirit which is very chary about having anything of a co-operative nature to do with other denominations.

A striking proof of this is seen in the refusal of the smaller sects to join with other groups in such interdenominational activities as are at present in existence. Take, for instance, the following table of membership in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

DENOMINATIONAL MEMBERSHIP IN THE FEDERAL COUNCIL CLASSED AS TO SIZE

Membership	*Bodies in the U. S.*	*Bodies in the Council*
Over 100,000	35	22
50,000– 100,000	9	1
25,000– 50,000	13	2
10,000– 25,000	26	2
5,000– 10,000	15	2
1,000– 5,000	43	1
Under 1,000	33	0

This table [20] is ample proof that denominations with a large constituency are more easily brought into a co-operative movement than are those with a small membership. Not that the size has *everything* to do with it. The Southern Baptists—one of the largest and most influential of the Protestant denominations—is not a member of the Council, while the Reformed Presbyterian Church, with only 2,400 members, is found included. Such important matters as those of denominational leadership, geographical location of the constituency, and traditional heritage enter into the making of decisions for and against federal co-operation. But the disproportion of the figures in the above table is too great not to carry some weight of proof of the point that the largest denominations are those which work co-operatively.

[20] The list used in calculating this table was taken from *Churches of the Federal Council*, by MacFarland, p. 13. The total Protestant bodies according to the table is 174. This is due to the inclusion of the colored bodies.

CHAPTER VII

CO-OPERATION AND HOME MISSIONS

Home Mission Boards and Their Work

According to the United States Religious Census Report [1] for 1916 a total of ninety Home Mission Boards of the various white Protestant denominations were in existence. This same report shows that these Boards "handled a total of $41,930,572". Of this amount, forty-five denominations gave $7,658,860 to philanthropic work such as hospitals, asylums, rescue homes, and relief of suffering; sixty-five denominations gave $17,007,837 to educational institutions, including universities, colleges, theological schools, and academies; while seventy-nine of them gave $17,263,840 to the more definitely specific home mission work, including the payment of whole or part salaries of 27,982 missionaries and aid of 29,283 churches. The *Year Book of the Churches* for 1923 cites as many as seventy Missionary Boards carrying on work in the homeland, whose total appropriation amounted to $26,374,387.01. Of this amount $7,936,879.04 was given to support of churches; $381,847.32 was used by thirteen societies in general evangelism; $607,961.02 was expended by twenty societies for work among the American Indians; $1,076,800.86 was used by twenty societies for christian-

[1] *Summary and General Tables*, Part I, pp. 90–93.

izing the mountaineers; $1,543,752.89 was spent by twenty-three societies in behalf of the Negroes; $1,556,-155.70 was used by at least twenty societies for work among the foreigners in the United States; while $1,373,629.61 was spent in the adjacent countries of Alaska, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico, and Latin America, and the balance used in education among home mission schools, for publication of periodicals, etc.

In this connection there arise two important questions. One of them is this: Does it require ninety Boards, as reported in the *United States Religious Census* of 1916, to administer $41,930,572 most economically, or the seventy Home Mission Societies, as reported in the *Church Year Book* of 1923, to expend $26,374,387.01 most economically? For reasons of economy and efficiency, unification of these Boards would certainly seem advisable, for, except in the sphere of competitive business, we would not find a similar situation prevailing, and even there co-operation is taking the place of competition wherever possible. For reasons of acquiring missionary funds these various Boards may be necessary at the present juncture, since many people will give if they think their money will be spent to advance their own particular brand of Christianity. But would not a reasonable presentation of the facts against denominationalism develop a temper of mind willing to support the Christian religion in the future; just as the presentation of denominational propaganda facts in the past has created the disposition to give only when and where "my" denomination is served?

Aid to Competing Churches

The other query of importance is: What percentage of existing churches are being aided; of those helped, how many are competing with other churches; and of the competing ones, how many may be considered as legitimately competing and how many are maintained purely for sectarian reasons?

On the basis of a survey of twenty-five counties in twenty-one states, out of a total of 1,025 churches, 211, or about 20%, were found to be receiving home mission aid. Another survey showed that of the churches located in 140 agricultural communities, at the time of the investigation one in seven, or about 14% were aided by home mission money. A detailed study of three denominations revealed that, of practically the total number of the churches in the Presbyterian U. S. A.,[2] 31.7% were found to be aided; of 1,508 Episcopalian churches analyzed, 36.4% were aided; while of 2,618 Northern Baptist churches studied, 16% were found to be helped. Of the 5,694 churches studied in the three denominations, 21.9% were aided. All of these intensive investigations showed a situation remarkably similar to that prevailing in the case of all white Protestant denominations in the nation in 1916, for the United States Census for that year gives

[2] The most trustworthy facts relative to this matter are those supplied by the Institute of Social and Religious Research, and, unless otherwise stated, the data used by the writer in answer to this question is taken from *Town and Country Churches in the United States*, by Morse and Brunner, especially Chap. VI; *American Agricultural Villages*, by Brunner, Hughes and Patten; and the pamphlet, *Home Mission Aid*, by C. Luther Fry.

29,283 aided churches out of a total of 183,505, or about 16%.

A matter of greater significance, however, is that covered by the latter part of our question, to wit, whether the aided churches are competing ones or not. In order to determine that point, obviously, some definition of what a competing church is, had to be found. As a working principle, a competing church was at first defined as one located in a town or village where there is more than one Protestant church. But manifestly, such a definition is unfair. There are towns with an economically prosperous, homogeneous, and church-loving population able to support two or even three and four churches, as well as communities with foreign speaking groups, which would require churches of various languages. Again, churches belonging to the immersionist denominations as against those practicing other modes of baptism, those using the liturgical as opposed to the non-liturgical form of service, or even those of "eccentric" or highly emotional types located in the same community could not be justly held as competing. On the basis of these assumptions the following facts were found to prevail in the case of the 211 aided churches in twenty-five counties: Thirty-four only had a free field, and seven were competing with churches of different languages, a legitimate competition—a total of forty-one. Another forty-one were found serving communities with churches of the above-named special modes of baptism, forms of service, etc.,—which may be classed also as a legitimate competition. But there follow seventy-eight which were competing with aided

churches, and fifty-one which were in competition with self-supporting churches of the same mode of baptism, or a similar form of worship—neither of which can be termed as justly legitimate. Summed up, the facts are these: The number of non-competing and legitimately competing churches comprised eighty-two, which is about two-fifths of the total number, while one hundred and twenty-nine, which is about three-fifths of the total, were in competition with churches of the same group—and, in the case of 60% of the latter, competition was aggravated by the further fact that aided churches competed with aided churches. So, if it is held legitimate for the immersionist group to compete with the liturgical group, and for these to compete with the Methodist, Congregationalist, and Presbyterian bodies, and *vice versa*, the fact remains that only about two-fifths of aided churches belong to this class; the other three-fifths are sustained thru mission aid in the presence of other similar churches.

Degree of Competition

The degree of competition is still further disclosed by the following: There was a total of twenty-six aided town churches situated in twelve communities with an average population of 5,220. In addition to the aided churches, these same communities had sixty self-supporting churches, which gives, counting both, one church for every 738 persons, or, counting only the self-supporting, a church for every 1,044 people. Again, there were forty-five aided churches located in villages situated in 38 communities with an average population of 865. In these

same villages there were seventy-four self-supporting churches, which gives, all told, one church for every 276 people, or one self-supporting church for each 444 persons. Besides, there were thirty-seven churches in twenty different towns with an average population of 3,990. In three of these localities there were fourteen churches, thirteen of which were aided. That means, of course, that for a combined population of 11,970 we have fourteen churches, with an average potential field of 855 people per organization, but only one of them is self-supporting. Surely that represents a vital missionary contribution. But in the seventeen other towns there was a total of 115 churches, twenty-six of which were subsidized. To count only the eighty-nine unsubsidized, we have more than five churches per town, or one for every 800 people. Even if, from the twenty-six aided churches, the four foreign-language speaking ones are deducted, there still remain at least twenty-two churches not needed from the point of view of population. Moreover, if we assume one thousand people to the church as being a fairly just theoretic proportion of churches and population, then of the 211 aided churches under discussion, one hundred and thirty-four could be dispensed with, and still leave enough self-supporting churches, were they properly distributed, to more than care for the religious life of the people.

This problem of the aided churches is not improved in the case of the 140 agricultural communities surveyed, since of those localities with country churches, it could be said that only "less than one-half", and of those

with village churches, it had to be written that "over one-half" reported churches receiving outside help. Of the entire number of 710 Protestant village churches in these 140 communities, 14% were being aided, with an average subsidy of $350, or a total of $32,171, the year before the survey was made. Merely to receive aid is one thing; if, however, the number of churches in the villages where those aided are located is considered, the acuteness of the home mission problem is clearly revealed, for, "of the 92 white village churches receiving aid, 26 were in villages having four, and 19 were in villages having 5 or more Protestant village churches each." [3]

In the case of the Presbyterian U. S. A., Episcopalian, and Northern Baptist denominations, investigation disclosed the following: "Of the 1,245 aided rural and town churches, 220 were located in two-church communities, 132 in three-church communities and 200 in communities having four or more churches each. In other words, 44% of the churches that received missionary grants were in places that had in every case at least one other Protestant church. This percentage would be far higher were it not for the large number of isolated open-country churches in the sample, as is demonstrated by the results of a separate study of the aided churches in small villages, those having 1,000 inhabitants or less. Analysis shows that of the 1,245 aided churches included in this phase of the study, 343 were located in villages of this size. Of this number 138 were located in one-church villages whose populations averaged 501 inhabitants, ninety-nine were in two-church villages

[3] Brunner, Hughes and Patten, *American Agricultural Villages*, p. 179.

whose populations averaged 512, while 106 were in places that had three or more churches and whose populations averaged 585. In other words, of the 343 aided churches in these tiny villages of fewer than 1,000 inhabitants, 205, or nearly three in every five, were in centers that had, in each case, at least one other white Protestant church; while 106, or more than three in every ten, were in places every one of which had two or more other Protestant churches." [4]

Thus these facts show, that whereas "competitive churches are not being disproportionately aided as compared with non-competitive", they do reveal "that a competitive church is as likely to be aided as is one that is non-competitive." [5]

Who Receives the Aid?

Another aspect of the home mission problem which has come to the fore in recent years is that pertaining to the objective for which the money is spent—whether to aid Negro, Indian, and foreign-language speaking churches, or native white ones. It has been shown conclusively in the case of one great denomination, that 71% of its home mission funds went to help native white churches.[6] In the absence of positive proof, no doubt many will increasingly be led to believe that other important denominations are following a similar practice, and will, therefore, demand that a change be made. At any rate, the home mission problem

[4] C. Luther Fry, *Home Mission Aid*, p. 23.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

is one of real seriousness, as all the above amply testifies, and it demands some solution.

Home Missions Council

The organization which is seeking to solve it in a statesmanlike manner is the Home Missions Council. Organized March, 1908, by officers of a few Home Mission Boards and Societies (the majority of whom had offices in New York City), with the sympathetic interest of a few Southern and Middle West organizations in the general plan, by 1917 its constituent membership included representatives of 34 boards and societies whose operations covered various phases of home mission enterprise, and comprised 13 different denominations[7] engaged in the home mission field activities in the United States and Canada. It holds its conferences in co-operation with the Council of Women for Home Missions, which comprises representative membership from the boards and societies of 21 different denominations. Its aim, as stated in its constitution, is, "to promote fellowship, conference and co-operation among Christian organizations doing missionary work in the United States, Canada, and their dependencies."[8]

In its earlier history, the Council in carrying out this constitution's promise limited its activities pretty generally to that of gathering and organizing information relative to the home missionary activities of its constituent organizations, testing out its own purposes, and discovering where the ideal of co-operation could best

[7] *Home Missions Council Report* for 1917, pp. 9–18.
[8] The 1926 *Annual Report*, p. 55, or 1917 *Report*, p. 3.

be carried on. Pursuant with this policy, such matters of general interest as the following engaged its attention:

Finding out the best methods for church finance, on the basis of what various denominations were using;

Working out a scheme for adequate missionary education which would help to lift missionary giving to an intelligent basis, both as to appeal and to contributions, in the case of the smaller denominations as well as the larger ones;

Helping to determine the wisdom or unwisdom of the apportionment plan from denominational experience;

Finding the best plan of recruiting mission forces;

Gathering information of state laws governing building, and where obstructive statutes were found, seeking to have them amended so as not to apply to religious or eleemosynary institutions;

Discovering the best method of conserving property value to the denomination involved, in case of a church's removal from one section to another;

Providing comity committees to help in relocating such churches, as well as locating those established for the first time;

Seeking to create a widespread interest in the lengthening of the span of human life thru the distribution of leaflets and tracts on the subject;

Helping in a general way to protect the rights of the Indians scattered in various states;

By devising a Home Mission Magazine of a high standard seeking to create and deepen a widespread interest in the great task of making America Christian.

This list of activities [9] gives some idea of the breadth of interest the Council possessed, as well as the careful way it set about its task of interdenominational co-operation. Many of these interests are still among its chief concerns. It is still gathering information. "The work of practically every standing committee of the Home Missions Council is primarily one of investigation, and one of the largest contributions which this organization has made to the cause of missions in America is the result of the collective study of home mission problems." [10] It lays increased emphasis on scientific study of facts and conditions of the common enterprise of home missions thru surveys and research work by specially trained representatives of the boards comprising its membership.[11] However, it has done vastly more than gather information; it has also pioneered in bringing the missionary boards of many denominations to co-operate in many ways for very practical ends.

Important Achievements of Home Mission Council

For one thing, thru the committee on New Americans, of the two Councils,[12] the co-operating boards have carried on an important work of welcoming strangers—immigrants—following them to their destinations and putting them in touch with Christian American friends and the church of their choice. It has given its voice

[9] Culled from the *Annual Report* of 1917, especially Appendix B, p. 219 f.

[10] *Annual Report*, 1917, p. 233.

[11] *Ibid.*, 1926, p. 91.

[12] Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions.

in such causes as the improvement of conditions at Ellis Island. It has also provided a united front in seeking to reach the migrant group of our population in the farm sections of the west and the lumberjacks of the timbered sections of Oregon and Washington. Thru its united effort six religious leaders have been provided for the government schools for Indians. After reaching thirty-three out of the total number of forty-nine such schools, these workers reported that they were receiving co-operation, encouragement, and appreciation from the principals and superintendents. The Union Theological Seminary in Mexico City, maintained by Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Protestant groups, is chiefly the result of the Council's efforts. It has also brought about a division of territory, whereby the Northern Presbyterians moved from the northern to the southern part of Mexico, where they were joined by the Southern Presbyterians after the withdrawal of their forces from Cuba and north Mexico, and the Disciples and Friends came in to occupy the field left vacant by these two Presbyterian denominations.[13] The Council encouraged and furthered the practice of unity among the Protestants of Porto Rico, resulting in a union religious monthly publication supported by eight denominations, which has the largest circulation of any publication in Porto Rico; the formation of the Evangelical Union, to promote co-operation among the various denominations in every form of activity, and wherever desirable and possible to promote organic union; [14] the

[13] *Annual Report*, 1917, p. 63.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Presbyterian Polytechnic Institute, San German, used by all evangelical churches; the Congregational school at Santurce, which serves as a union Young Women's Seminary; and the Methodist schools, which supply elementary education for all denominational groups.[15] By common agreement the evangelization of Haiti has been given to the Northern Baptists; the south side of the island of San Domingo to a board composed of Methodists, Presbyterians and United Brethren; and the north side of the island to the board of the Free Methodists. An interdenominational council in El Paso, Texas, in 1913 adopted certain comity rules governing work among the Spanish speaking people of the southwest, from which the following results have come:

"In Texas there is an understanding that in cities up to 10,000, one church is not to enter if another is occupying the field. The Disciples, the Methodists (South) and Presbyterians (U. S.) co-operate in this agreement. In Colorado and Arizona there have been few conflicts. In New Mexico, the Presbyterians (U. S. A.) and the Methodists (North) are working together satisfactorily, and have evolved an arrangement whereby Presbyterians will be limited to the northern part, and Methodists will have priority in the southern part of the state. In California co-operation in general has been only fairly satisfactory. Around Los Angeles there has been some districting and the superintendents' councils of Los Angeles and San Francisco function in eliminating the majority of difficulties. It may be said that in New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado, all overlapping be-

[15] *Annual Report*, 1917, p. 70.

tween Methodists (North) and Presbyterians (U. S. A.) has been eliminated with the exception of Denver, Colorado; Las Cruces, New Mexico; and Douglas, Arizona." [16]

While the report shows that there have been failures in this comity relationship, these affect only 5% of the three hundred points occupied by Protestant missions.

But it is in connection with interdenominational missionary work with the English speaking churches that the work of the Home Missions Council has proved its greatest usefulness. Facing the flagrantly unequal distribution of churches thruout the country—illustrated by the situation in western Washington, where, of 573 communities with a population of from 10 to 1,000, only 194 had any churches at all (these number from 1 to 5 to each village), while there were 379 such communities without churches; where the practice of granting mission aid to competing churches was usual, thus fostering unwise competition and a state of permanent mendicancy—the Council set heroically about to right these wrongs. The general method of procedure was that of working out principles of comity to be followed by the co-operating agencies, leaving the forces on the field to put them into actual practice, giving direct aid only when asked.

Comity Principles

The method of procedure recommended by the Committee of Comity and Co-operation, and adopted by the Council in its annual session in 1918, which serves

[16] *Annual Report of Home Missions Council*, 1926, p. 51 f.

as the basis for Home Missions Councils in the majority of the eleven states [17] where definite comity agreements have been set up, has for its essential features the following: All evangelical bodies which care to do so, jointly endeavor to meet the religious needs thruout a whole state; make no attempt whatever to obliterate denominations, or to merge them, but rather, magnify and use to the utmost their splendid *esprit de corps;* assemble the state denominational heads in the capital of the state, where, after unhurried prayer, they shall make a restudy of the gospel, along with a thoro analysis of the state's religious needs, together visit typical fields to acquire a more vivid conception of the real situation, then reassemble for prayer and formation of plans whereby, thru a redistribution of working forces and allocation of territory, if necessary, every community of the state shall be supplied with the gospel with a view of making the spirit of Christ all-controlling in as many individual lives as possible, and also all-controlling in as many of the community relationships of life as possible.[18] The comity principles which have been worked out and adopted by the Council to apply to English-speaking work in the states, towns, and country fields are these: [19]

1. A field shall be regarded as adequately occupied

[17] These are Washington, California, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin. *Annual Report*, 1926, p. 31. The State Commissions in Maine and Massachusetts were organized independently of the Home Missions Council, but co-operate.

[18] Pamphlet entitled *Every Community Service Endeavour*, issued by the Council.

[19] *Annual Report*, 1926, pp. 101–103.

when, for each 1,000 population, homogeneous as to language and color and reasonably accessible from a given point, there is present one church, meeting at least the following minimum standard of service and equipment:

Resident pastor devoting full time to work of the ministry,
Public worship every Sabbath,
Sunday school meeting regularly,
Edifice reasonably adequate to needs of the community for worship, religious training, and service,

Provided that, where a church has or is proposed to have the exclusive occupancy of a field, it will receive in Christian fellowship all varieties of evangelical Christians without subjecting them to doctrinal or other tests which do not accord with the standards of their respective faiths.

2. Conversely, a condition of over-churching and competition shall be held to exist where the number of churches in the community exceeds the above ratio, if at least one church per 1,000 people maintains this minimum standard of service and equipment.

3. Where, within the terms of this definition, an aided church is maintained in competition with a self-supporting church (i. e. a church which draws its current support exclusively from the given community), the latter, if it meets the minimum standard, shall be regarded as entitled to the field and the grant in aid to the competing church shall be decreased annually, looking to the complete cessation of aid at the end of three years.

4. Where no one of the churches in an over-churched

community is self-supporting as above defined, the denominations concerned should confer at once to determine what church should be asked to undertake the responsibility of maintaining at least the minimum standard of service and equipment in that community (except that if one of such aided churches now maintains the minimum standard it shall be regarded as entitled to the field, and aid should be withdrawn from the others as indicated under "3" above).

The following alternative methods of adjustment are generally recognized as applicable under these circumstances:

The unconditional withdrawal of one denomination in favor of the other, or

The withdrawal of one denomination in favor of the other on the basis of a reciprocal exchange (i. e. favoring the withdrawing denomination in another community), or

The withdrawal of both in favor of a third not now present, or the formation of a federated or community church.

5. No new enterprise should be initiated with missionary support in contravention of the above principles.

6. Mission aid for building purposes should not be given a competing church as above defined.

7. In the expenditure of missionary money in the Town and Country field the following objects should be regarded as of primary importance:

(a) As a first responsibility to build up the highest type of service standard for each church which now has or which is proposed to have the exclusive responsi-

bility for a field. (For this purpose, the simplified Par Standard as worked out by the Committee on Town and Country is recommended.)

(b) To strengthen particularly for demonstration purposes, churches which face situations of unusual difficulty or unusual strategic importance.

(c) Adequately to occupy now unoccupied communities and to serve now unreached populations.

8. Where the work of a given church is to be discontinued, the policy should be definitely to dissolve its organization and unite its membership with other existing churches.

9. As a step on the way to complete co-operation, competition is held to be particularly unjustifiable if between churches belonging to the same one of the following recognized groups:

(1) Liturgical churches,

(2) Churches practicing the baptism of believers only,

(3) Churches of other denominations represented in these Councils.

10. Each mission board or agency is urged immediately to undertake a study of its aided churches to determine where competition as above defined exists.

State Councils' Work

Following these general recommendations on "procedure" and "principles of comity" eleven state councils have been formed in as many different states, nor are the results disappointing. For instance, in the case of Montana, a complete reallocation of the working

forces to the territory of the state was made along the following lines: Thirty-nine different places or areas were assigned each to one denomination asking for them because already occupied by the denomination in question. Thirty-nine other places or areas where two denominations each had made the request to work, were dealt with in three ways: "(a) Sometimes a closer definition of the area revealed the fact that one denomination had rightful claims upon but a single community, while another denomination might legitimately cultivate the rest of the area; (b) in some places it was straightway recognized that one denomination should yield to another because of the latter's priority of occupancy, or because of its continued and successful cultivation of the field in question; but (c) perhaps the majority of cases were referred to the responsible denominational agents for further investigation of the conditions involved, and of the rights and equities in each case." [20] But this still left as many as twenty-nine specifically reported places or areas without any religious work. These were assigned as home-mission areas to the different responsible denominations involved. Wherefore, we see as a splendid result of this interdenominational co-operation, that 107 different areas were allocated to responsible missionary forces, in which because of unity of effort, sectarian competition was reduced to a minimum of fields already occupied, and the unoccupied areas provided for.

Moreover, a clearer realization of the state's real needs was gained, suspicion and distrust between the forces

[20] *The Montana Plan* (Pamphlet), pp. 4–5.

were disarmed, and a growing psychological preparation for continued fellowship and co-operation produced. The official spokesmen for the co-operating bodies are enthusiastic in their estimate of the work already being done and of the prospects under this form of co-operation.[21] In its 1926 report the Montana Council states, "the thing we are doing right now is the biggest and hardest thing—tabulating total home-mission expenditure in each field where two or more churches are aided with a view to setting forth so all can see whether we are 'wise stewards of God's money'. We mean to get the figures on each field where there is apparent overlapping and let the facts speak." [22] To say what such co-operative effort will mean in allaying the prevalent criticism, much of it just, of the way in which home-mission money is spent is not easy to determine, but that it will go far toward doing so cannot be gainsaid.

Nor is it in Montana alone that such splendid interdenominational accomplishments are being realized. In Idaho the State Home Missions Council has allocated 62 fields, as well as having helped to produce an increasing spirit of understanding and fellowship between the co-operating denominations. The North Dakota State Council is co-operatively planning to reach every area or place in the state thru reassignment of forces and allocation of territory. In Nevada as many as ten fields, in each of which two denominations were struggling to develop and maintain work, have

[21] These represent Northern Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Evangelical Association, Protestant Episcopal, Methodists (North and South), Presbyterian, United Brethren and Lutheran bodies.

[22] *Home Missions Council Report*, 1926, p. 42.

been reallocated to one denomination each, for intensive cultivation; denominational colporteurs have been assigned to specific territory so as not to be overlapping with each other; and steps for a co-ordination of forces for all the state are under way. The Western Washington State Council is working together to have one church only in each locality, until it becomes large enough to support the second, and providing that the population of each community shall determine which *one* denomination it shall have. In Wyoming at least two specific instances of definite results from co-operative work have been accomplished in the case of the Methodist and Presbyterian leaders, each of these denominations withdrawing from certain fields in favor of the other, and to the advantage of both places involved.[23]

Presbyterians (North and South)

Encouraging instances of this splendid co-operation are not wanting in other states. For instance, in Texas the Presbyterian churches (North and South) have very nearly done away with rivalry between themselves. Between the years 1908–1917, in forty-four Texas towns containing churches of these bodies, duplication was eliminated. The U. S. A. church transferred twenty of its churches to the U. S. church, and the U. S. body transferred twenty-four churches to the U. S. A. church.[24] This interchange took place under the encouragement and help of the Home Missions Council.

[23] All facts regarding these state accomplishments from pp. 40 to 51 of the *Annual Report of Home Missions Council*, 1926.

[24] *Annual Report of Home Missions Council*, 1917, p. 126.

Town and Country Churches

In meeting the town and country church problem the Council has taken stand on three important points. One relates to home mission grants of aid to competing churches, another to its effort to build denominational community churches, and the third to making provision for long-term resident pastorates in town and country areas. Its official pronouncement on the first-named point is that given on pages 149–152, above. Its relation to the community church idea is set forth in the following terms: "Resolved, that the Commission of Church and Country Life recommend to denominational controlling boards and officials that they make provision so far as possible for co-operation in the organization and maintenance of community churches in rural communities." [25] Its aim with regard to the pastorate is connected with the two points above. Instead of different denominations giving support to several weak churches, which of necessity will have only part-time resident pastorates, it proposes that a joint effort be made to establish a denominational community church, the salary for a resident pastor being jointly provided. How this general plan works out in practice is set forth in some of the specific items of state co-operation which have been cited above.

Perhaps the most important and far-reaching of all action yet taken with respect to co-operation in home missions is that of the adoption of a "five-year program of survey and adjustment in the field of Interdenomina-

[25] *Annual Report*, 1917, p. 172.

tional Comity in Home Missions", which, among other proposals, includes the following:

1. A survey of the whole field of interdenominational comity in Home Mission work.

2. An intensive and sustained effort to secure the indicated adjustments by the various denominational and local groups.

3. The attainment of the following practical objectives:

(a) The elimination within a definite period of all competition between denominations whose Boards are constituent to the Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions in which the use of home mission funds is involved.

(b) The furtherance of understandings between denominations, constituent to the Home Missions Council, Council of Women for Home Missions, or the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, looking to the elimination of competition in which home mission funds are not involved.

(c) The allocation of responsibility on a non-competitive basis for needed extensions of Christian work and securing the acceptance of such allocations by the bodies concerned.

(d) The securing of co-operation of the bodies concerned in the initiation of any necessary projects to be conducted jointly, as, for example, the formation of interdenominational Larger Parishes, the joint provision of religious education facilities, the provision of unified religious services at public institutions, Farm and Cannery Migrants, Religious Work Directors in

Government Indian Schools, Bureau of Reference for Migrating People, etc.

(e) Strengthening or creating the necessary interdenominational bodies, local or regional, to assist in carrying the above points into effect and to provide channels for co-operative action in other fields of interest.

(f) Securing a special fund for the attainment of the above objectives.[26]

The town and country pastors of New York in conference at Ithaca (1925) took the following significant action: "With the example before us of what has been accomplished in such states as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming; with the knowledge that in each church body there are many ministers and laymen who desire to see our over-churched hamlets and villages reorganized, and with the belief that the Christian people in most of the rural communities would welcome a united conference of their respective state and district officials to study their problems and to advise them, we suggest: That the Home Missions Council call some group or district meetings in New York state, to which shall be invited the administrative officials of each denomination having churches in the respective districts, which meetings shall be for the purpose of allocating unchurched and neglected areas

[26] Adopted by the National Church Comity Conference, Cleveland, Ohio, January 21, 1928, and approved by the Home Missions Council, the Council of Women for Home Missions, and the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in Cleveland, January 23, 1928.

to the care of specific denominations, similar to the plan recently adopted in New Hampshire; and arranging mutual exchange of churches in small communities that are now badly over-churched and which call for immediate attention; and that, if possible, the denominations agree upon and allocate one man to give his entire time to assisting in setting up these district meetings and making such adjustments as may be found practicable, for a definite period of not less than three months; that in helping the churches and denominations to co-operate in the interests of the Kingdom, principles of comity be worked out by the council in co-operation with the New York council of churches to guide in solving the interdenominational problems of our rural communities." [27]

Encouraging Procedure

All of which surely goes to prove that real progress is being made in getting denominations to work together in this home mission endeavour, rather than in competition and rivalry. That much still remains to be done is obvious to all. Principles of comity are infinitely more easily framed on paper than incorporated in the work on specified fields. Many officials as well as laymen believe more strongly in the possibilities of co-operation and harmony as matters of theory, than as practical concerns. Yet there is ample ground for encouragement. For one thing, the task is being approached from the sane view of full acknowledgment of past denominational contributions to the religious

[27] *The Christian Century*, June 10, 1926.

life of the country, as well as with the purpose of conserving existing denominational interests whenever possible. This is the course of wisdom. The Baptist denomination is not different from others, and to know that 97% of its churches on the Pacific slope, eleven out of the twelve largest churches in Kansas, and forty-five out of the fifty next largest were all founded by mission agencies and supported by missionary funds in their early years,[28] gives an historical background for denominational effort which is very powerful in its appeal. Such a history, as is that of others involving the same traditional experience, is a fertile soil in which to grow an abiding denominational consciousness. However, when, to the traditional experience of the worthy denominational history cited above, we oppose the fact that in one year the Methodist Episcopal denomination withdrew home mission aid from as many as 200 competing churches,[29] together with the admission of the friends of former methods—that at least 10% of money given for home mission objects had been spent in the past in positive disservice to the spiritual interests of the aided churches—then there is ample ground for believing that the future of the present widespread effort at interdenominational co-operation is bright.

Do Home Mission Boards Officials Approve?

This future, naturally, depends upon the personal attitude of those who are in charge of the work of the

[28] *The Watchman Examiner*, October 14, 1926.
[29] *The Christian Century*, October 7, 1926.

home, state, or diocesan boards. The writer's questionnaire supplies very important information on this point. Thirty home boards were questioned; twenty-six sent replies. The following gives questions and answers in detail:

1. Is there any effort made to avoid overlapping of your board's work with that of other denominational boards working in the same territory? Twenty-two replied in the affirmative; four in the negative.

2. Do you expend funds to help weak churches located in towns and localities where boards of other denominations are doing the same? Fifteen confessed that they did; nine denied doing so, and two were uncertain.

2 (a). Is there anything being done to avoid this? Eighteen said yes; three replied no; five gave no answer.

3. Do you conduct investigations for the purpose of gathering information touching the matter of over-churched and under-churched conditions of towns and localities? Nineteen replied that they did; seven that they did not.

4. What is the general position of your board relative to the matter of interdenominational missionary activities? Nineteen boards were favorably inclined; four opposed; two on the fence; one did not answer.

5. What is your personal opinion on the subject of interdenominational co-operation in missionary work? Twenty strongly favored it; three were as strongly opposed; three did not answer.

A few of the replies received deserve a longer mention than the above tabulation. For instance, one answer to question three runs as follows: "We investigate as it

affects our own work but beyond that have done little." The same person answered number five: "By no means so simple as appears in some literature, but to be approached gradually tho surely." Both of these answers reveal a deep underlying seriousness concerning the problem, and tho the former carries a denominational aloofness, the latter voices a warm personal interest and hope. Another reply brings valuable information as to the working of the principles of comity between two of the Presbyterian denomination, telling how in towns of less than 5,000, if one is at work, the other does not come in, and where two churches are located in one of these towns, they are urged to federate. Of the entire list of twenty-six replies only one of importance represented a completely negative position regarding the entire matter. This stated that there was no overchurched area in its board's territory, nor did either the board or its secretary believe in interdenominational co-operation. It did affirm interest in "intra-co-operation" in missionary work.

One of the most interesting situations revealed by this questionnaire is that, while there are a number of denominations expending money to help weak churches in small towns and communities where others were doing the same, over 50% of these same denominations were originating plans to avoid doing it. Then, taken together, these answers reveal a preponderant majority in favor of co-operation. So, one cannot but be convinced that, in so far as the officials of the various home mission boards are concerned, the future is to see an increasing amount of co-operative work.

In his address before the Home Missions Council at its tenth annual meeting, on "The Present Status of Co-operation in Home Missions", Dr. A. W. Anthony said: "The weak point just now in home mission work is in state organizations and officers. They are on the old lines of sectarian differences and competition. They have not yet as fully caught the generous spirit of co-operation, alliance and combination as have the national home mission boards." Then, representing those most eager for co-operation to be the home mission board officials, at one end, and the people of the local churches who feel the stress of new conditions and want a new fellowship in solving community problems, at the other end, he concludes, "but too often they are held apart by state denominational leaders and compelled to perpetuate old sectarian differences because of state denominational plans and policies." [30]

The writer's questionnaire includes seventeen answers from as many state board officials. While the number, comparatively, is not as large as in the case of the home mission board officials, yet it suffices to throw light on the attitude of these state boards and their secretaries.

To question number 1, fourteen answered in the affirmative; two in the negative; one left it unanswered. To number 2, sixteen gave an affirmative reply, and one failed to answer. To number 2 (a), six answered affirmatively; eight negatively; three gave no answer. To number 3, ten said investigations were always made; four replied no; three gave no answer. To number 4, seven represented their boards as most favorable

[30] *Annual Report*, 1917, p. 139.

toward co-operation; nine represented theirs as strongly opposed; one gave no answer. To number 5, thirteen were very much for co-operation as a matter of principle, while four confessed to a strong dislike for it in any form.

Of all replies, those from the officials of state boards were in some respects the most interesting. Several revealed very deep feelings on the problem of interdenominationalism, due, perhaps, to the nearness of the writers to the practical side of the local fields—for theirs is the immediate task of starting local churches. This is reflected, for instance, in one answer to number four, which runs, "We are ready to co-operate in a general way, but whenever we find a promising nucleus of Disciples, we establish a Christian church." Or in this, "Each denomination seems to be for self regardless and we spend money in competitive fields for the reason—it seems we have to because others do it." The writers of both these answers stated they were personally strong for co-operation. One Baptist official delivered himself as follows: "Baptists can co-operate with other denominations in Sunday school work, evangelistic services and temperance reform, but they cannot otherwise for they have a distinct mission." And then this final thrust, "Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists ought to effect organic union. They preach Christian union, they ought to practice it; then Baptists would be free to maintain Baptist churches wherever Baptists congregate." Still another Baptist secretary affirmed that "interdenominational work is to save money on the part of those who love money more than

religion." While those who showed least friendliness or sympathy toward interdenominational activities were Baptists, yet there was one who wrote, "While co-operation is yet not very vital, and prejudice is yet deeply intrenched, that it is a sin for our churches to do the way they have done in the past and even yet in the present, is beginning to dawn on church folk." By far the most friendly replies came from officers of Congregational boards. One such, while confessing his state custom of aiding competing churches in a few instances, affirmed that "of the 115 English-speaking churches of the commonwealth receiving mission aid, seventy of them are the only churches in the community where they are placed."

On the basis of these replies one feels that Dr. Anthony's analysis of the situation with respect to state denominational officials is, on the whole, correct. Nevertheless, there is ground for believing that this "weak point" will be rapidly strengthened, when, of the seventeen answers received, thirteen came from officials who were personally very heartily in favor of the principles of comity and co-operation between denominations, and when, of these who served denominations practicing the custom of helping weak churches in competitive fields, 50% were opposed to the custom and desired to see it changed.

CHAPTER VIII

CO-OPERATION AND THE "UNITED" CHURCHES

The United Churches

One significant phase of Christian unity appearing today among Christians of varying denominational connections is that which finds expression in the "United" or "Community" churches. Reference to them has already been made as concrete illustrations of the fact that Christians of divergent denominations can be brought together in working and worshiping harmony. To say that these churches are the organized expression of the desire for union on the part of Christians in local communities would come nearer the truth than to classify them as products of interdenominational activity. This is certainly the case in their earlier history. Then, more often than otherwise, denominational officials opposed them, as frequently happens now, especially respecting the undenominational type of union church. But numerous instances are not lacking which show that these officials have come to recognize them as a vital element in our present-day church life, and are giving to them their warmest endorsement. This is especially true in the New England section,[1] where

[1] Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont have done much along this line, as have Ohio and Illinois in recent years.

state federations have co-operated in bringing together local churches, and in some of the middle-western states. It is the result also of effort on the part of the Home Missions Council.[2] But whatever the "how" of their origin, these united or community churches have enjoyed a rapid increase in numbers during the last two or three decades.

By April, 1918, the writer had assembled by means of an extensive correspondence the names and addresses of what were reported to be 168 federated, union, and community churches. While 121 replies to a questionnaire sent to the pastors of these churches brought to light the facts that sixteen were purely denominational, five had tried federation and failed, there remained a total of 106 whose polity and work placed them in an authenticated list of united churches. This was the largest list of such churches then known to exist.[3]

The table on page 168 shows the types and distribution of these 106 churches in the 1918 compilation.

But this table represented the situation as it existed ten years ago. By June, 1922, there were 713 such churches listed, with an additional 118 existing but unlisted, giving a total of 831.[4] Two years later (1924), when the Institute of Social and Religious Research had accumulated the data on which was based its recent book treating of these churches, the number had grown

[2] See above, Chapter VII.

[3] So wrote Dr. Gill, who was engaged at the time in the Ohio State Church Survey, and Dr. Roy B. Guild, then a field representative of the Federal Council in Federation of Churches work. Forty-five of the 168 did not answer.

[4] D. R. Piper, *Handbook of the Community Church Movement in the United States*, p. 75.

State	*Federated*	*Denominational United*	*Undenominational United*
California	2	0	0
Colorado.....	0	1	0
Connecticut	1	0	0
Illinois.....	3	3	0
Iowa.....	4	1	1
Kansas.....	4	2	1
Louisiana	0	0	1
Massachusetts ..	16	9	9
Michigan.....	4	1	0
Missouri.....	1	0	0
Nebraska	2	0	0
New York	1	1	1
New Hampshire.	5	0	0
Ohio.....	0	2	0
Oregon.....	2	0	0
Oklahoma.....	1	0	0
Pennsylvania ...	1	0	0
Rhode Island ...	0	0	1
Texas.....	2	0	0
Vermont.....	14	3	1
Wisconsin.....	1	0	0
Washington	3	1	0
Totals	67	24	15

to 977, exclusive of those in the southern states and Missouri.[5]

About one month before the book just referred to came from the press, the writer procured from the editor of *The Community Churchman*, Park Ridge, Illinois, his entire list of community churches. This con-

[5] Elizabeth R. Hooker, *United Churches*, p. 28.

tained the names and addresses of 1293. The following table will show their distribution by types and states.

TABLE SHOWING TYPES OF COMMUNITY CHURCHES BY STATES ACCORDING TO THE LIST PROCURED BY THE WRITER FROM THE OFFICE OF *The Community Churchman*, PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS

States	*Undenominational or Union*	*Federated*	*Denominational*	*Undesignated*	*Total*
Alabama	1	0	4	0	5
Arizona	4	2	5	0	11
Arkansas	1	0	1	0	2
California	24	12	35	6	77
Colorado	11	4	12	6	33
Connecticut	5	21	7	1	34
Dist. Columbia	1	0	0	0	1
Florida	3	0	5	2	10
Idaho	3	3	19	0	25
Illinois	25	22	18	6	71
Indiana	7	4	3	2	16
Iowa	24	17	17	13	71
Kansas	4	21	9	1	35
Kentucky	2	0	2	0	4
Louisiana	2	1	1	0	4
Maine	10	20	11	1	42
Maryland	0	1	2	0	3
Massachusetts	57	52	23	4	136
Michigan	10	14	5	11	40
Minnesota	13	12	9	2	36
Mississippi	0	0	1	0	1
Missouri	26	7	4	0	37
Montana	1	4	33	0	38
Nebraska	8	12	7	4	31
Nevada	0	1	0	0	1
New Hampshire	1	24	4	0	29
New Jersey	9	0	5	2	16
New Mexico	3	0	1	0	4
New York	31	20	12	1	64
North Carolina	2	0	6	0	8
North Dakota	2	0	4	1	7
Ohio	25	34	31	5	95
Oklahoma	8	2	5	0	15
Oregon	7	5	35	2	49

TABLE SHOWING TYPES OF COMMUNITY CHURCHES—*Continued*

States	*Undenominational or Union*	*Federated*	*Denominational*	*Undesignated*	*Total*
Pennsylvania	13	4	6	1	24
Rhode Island	0	1	0	0	1
South Dakota	1	4	11	0	16
Tennessee	2	0	2	3	7
Texas	10	1	2	2	15
Utah	0	1	1	0	2
Vermont	13	44	8	2	67
Virginia	1	0	1	0	2
Washington	13	16	39	5	73
West Virginia	2	0	0	0	2
Wisconsin	10	3	8	1	22
Wyoming	0	1	10	0	11
Totals	395	390	424	83	1,293

THEIR ORIGIN AND GROWTH

A study of these churches is important, not only because of their numerical growth, but equally, or more so, because they are a comparatively recent development within American Protestantism. The oldest of the 977 united churches discussed by Miss Hooker was a federated church in Massachusetts dating its origin from 1887.[6] While the writer's list contained one "Union" church which dated its origin from 1869, the information given further stated that it had become practically a Congregational church, located in a growing city, and that the idea of union was hardly stressed now. Of the remaining 105 in the writer's list, the dates of organization were given in the case of 96; four originated in the decade 1890–1900; ten between 1900–1910; eighty-four during the eight years from 1910–1918. Of

[6] *United Churches*, p. 25.

the 977 united churches listed by the Institute's survey as surviving in 1924, only forty-four had been formed prior to 1912, leaving 933 which originated during the eleven years from 1913–1923 inclusive.[7] This gives an average of nearly 85 a year. Calculated on the basis of the difference between the list of the Institute and that of *The Community Churchman*, the last two years had an average of 158. While this calculation makes for an unusually large yearly average in 1925–1926, it is accounted for in part because the list from which it is made includes community churches of cities and their suburbs, whereas those dealt with by the Institute[8] were almost wholly located in towns of 5,000 and under.

The Various Types

A study of these churches reveals that they belong to several different types. The generally accepted classifications are the Federated, the Denominational, and the Undenominational or Independent churches.[9] However, a fourth description called the affiliated church is added by Miss Hooker,[10] while others give two more besides—the Pepperell and the Latitudinarian types.[11]

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[8] This refers to the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Since by far the most exhaustive treatment thus far made of the community churches is that of this organization in its book, *United Churches*, frequent reference to it will be made by the single word "Institute". See also *Community Churches*, David R. Piper.

[9] *United Churches*, p. 35, and Zumbrunnen, *The Community Church*, p. 80.

[10] *United Churches*, pp. 36, 98–108.

[11] David R. Piper, *A Handbook of the Community Church Movement*, pp. 12–21.

Pepperell and Latitudinarian Types

The last-named is especially characterized by its broad basis of membership, the theory being that the church's membership is co-terminous with the population of the community. The writer found only one of these in his survey, and Dr. Piper names only one such in his *Handbook;* the inference is logical, therefore, that churches of this type are very rare. The Pepperell type is set apart in virtue of the peculiar circumstances of its origin. The two churches involved in this particular federation had property holdings which would be lost if either gave up its form of organization. Since they desired very strongly to unite despite this property handicap, the way out was provided by the organization of a "community society" to which both churches turned over their property, and which, as individuals, the members of the societies joined. Since this type does not possess any peculiarly distinguishing church demands in such matters as polity, worship, etc., it need not be regarded as vitally important. Its chief value lies in its suggestions of means of overcoming legal snares regarding property holding. Wherefore, the four classifications used by the writer in this study are the three into which his own list readily falls, to wit, the Federated, Denominational, and Undenominational or Independent, together with the Affiliated, discovered in the survey made by the Institute.

Federated Type

The federated type includes churches which have been formed in communities thru the combination of

two or more local churches of different denominations, which agree to act together as regards local affairs. Generally speaking, the different denominational units keep their own church roll, trustees for holding their respective properties, and support of their respective denominational boards. They unite in the support of one pastor, in the service of worship, and in the conduct of their Sunday school. Not infrequently these federations have been formed for a limited time, as a period of six months, a year, or two years, after which, if all has gone well, they may enter into a permanent agreement. When each of the churches thus combining owns a house of worship, they frequently alternate for stated periods in the use of these buildings for worship and Sunday school, or use one for worship, another for educational and social activities, etc. This method of using the properties is pretty generally adhered to during the experimental stage of federation unless one building is vastly superior to all others, in which case the best one will be used. Repairs of property are usually made from a common fund.

In the more intimate matters of worship and fellowship, principles of tolerance and broad sympathy are called into play. For instance, several matters are conducted according to the traditional customs of the federating churches, such as membership accessions and dismissals, form of baptism, hymns for congregational singing which are those common to many different hymnals, and Sunday school literature which is interdenominational in character. The pastor is employed

"to preach the gospel of Christ and the principles of Christian living and not any 'ism' ".[12]

The above sets forth in summary fashion the usual procedure in the case of the large majority of federated churches. Variations from this general standard, however, are not lacking. For one thing, the limitation of membership requirements to the customs of the federating churches having barred people of other denominations from joining, has led to a broadening of the requirements in regard to this particular point. The same is true concerning benevolence funds, Sunday school work, and the administering of the Lord's Supper. The tendency in this type of church is toward an ever-widening community service. Especially is this the fact when a federated church finds itself the only Protestant church in the locality.

Undenominational Type

The undenominational type of united churches comprises those which seek "to function for the whole community into which may come every variety of faith and experience, but which are independent of all other ecclesiastical organizations." [13] They are formed sometimes by local churches of varying denominational units. Of ninety-one such churches located by Miss Hooker, about the origin of which detailed knowledge was ob-

[12] All of the above facts are culled from the *Articles of Federation* of (a) the Methodist and Congregational Federated church of Castleton, Vt., (b) the Presbyterian and Baptist Federated church of Brighton, Mich., (c) the Baptist and Disciples United church of Swampscott, Mass., and others.

[13] Zumbrunnen, *The Community Church*, p. 81.

tained, forty-one had been formed thru the combination of two or more existing denominational units.[14] Of fifteen such churches appearing in the writer's list, only two were formed by the combination of local denominational churches. All the others were the result of individual initiative on the part of Christians representing from two to ten denominations in each church. In one instance two local denominational churches had disbanded, after which the remnants got together, organized an undenominational community church, and invited Christians of all sects to join. This, as a matter of fact, characterizes a majority of the churches of this group. They have originated in the activity of individual Christians. They have been known formerly as "Union" or "Independent" churches in the newer communities of the west.[15]

The reasons for forming undenominational churches may be summarized as follows: Inability to bring together into a single organization diverse denominational elements upon any other basis; a desire to gain the support of people outside of all churches; reaction against competing denominational churches, involving current suspicion of abuse of home mission funds; desire to escape ecclesiastical overhead expense and outside control or interference; examples of such churches not far away; and a definite propaganda favorable to them.[16]

The churches of this type, as their name would imply, are characterized by a very broad basis of membership.

[14] *United Churches*, pp. 63–64.
[15] D. R. Piper, *Handbook of Community Churches*, pp. 18–20.
[16] *United Churches*, p. 65.

These standards range all the way from the traditional inheritance of the units to that of counting the membership in the community and that in the church as the same. The number of churches professing this extreme latitudinarian basis of membership is small. In 1922 there were only about twenty such in the east, counting those located in cities—but none of them seems to be living up, or down, to this ideal.[17] The great majority of the undenominational churches receive members according to the following: "Members in good standing in any evangelical church may, upon signing the constitution, become members of this church. These joining for the first time, do so by affirming publicly their acceptance of Jesus Christ, their determination to live the Christian life, and their acceptance of the Apostle's Creed." But there is one point peculiar to this type of church; it allows for what is practically a double church membership. That is, one is not asked to sever his connection with the church to which he already belongs, in order to join one of these churches.

The form of baptism is left to the choice of the individual; in some instances churches do not require it. But the by-laws of one of these churches, after stating that the mode will be in accordance with the individual's wish, adds this rather significant provision, "if they have no preference they may be baptized by immersion, since that way is generally acceptable to all denominations".

The ordinance of the Lord's Supper is observed in some, monthly; in others, bi-monthly; while in others,

[17] David R. Piper, *Handbook of Community Churches*, p. 21.

once a quarter. Obviously "open" communion prevails thruout.

Regularly ordained ministers of some evangelical denomination are preferred as pastors for these churches. No sample "Articles of Agreement" in the writer's possession contain a statement of the character of the gospel message which the pastor is expected to preach, but in the nature of the case emphasis must be placed upon the general principle of Christian life, rather than upon doctrine or sectarian differences. The claim of this group of churches is that they place service above dogma.[18]

Denominational Type

The denominational type of united churches in its general characteristics falls in between the federated and the undenominational groups. These are similar to the more conservative undenominational variety in that they receive members from all evangelical churches; like the federated in their retention of some denominational connection; and akin to both in that they are formed by the combination of local denominational units, as well as by the union of individual Christians. But their chief distinguishing characteristic resides in their maintenance of ecclesiastical connection with some evangelical denomination. Their connection, however, is maintained with but one denomination, a differentiation from the federated type of church. This single ecclesiastical relation may be that of one of the com-

[18] All of above facts culled from the *Manuals* (in the writer's possession) of the Union churches located at Greenwood, Mass., Nobscot, Mass., Primero, Colo., Conesus, N. Y., and Oakmont, Pa.

bined churches, or it may be different from any within the local union. Instances where this latter happened are numerous. The writer's questionnaire included one case where the local church was formed thru the union of Baptist, Lutheran, and Methodist elements, and then became a member of the Presbyterian church of the U. S. A. Still another illustration of the same is that in which the uniting segments came from the Disciples and the Methodists, but formed a denominational connection with the General Conference of Mennonites of North America. But more often than not, the ecclesiastical connection is made with the denomination represented by one of the combining local units.

Sometimes a denominational church, alone in the field, has become a member of this type by changing its condition of membership to embrace members of all evangelical churches. An illustration of this is a Baptist church in Illinois which adopted the open membership policy and tho disfellowshipped by its district association, still retains membership in the state convention and contributes to the various Baptist boards.[19] Undenominational churches have become denominational by voting to align themselves with some particular denomination. An illustration is a church in Missouri which voted to change its name to "The Community Presbyterian Church".[20] Naturally, the fact of being connected with some denomination has simplified for these churches some of the knotty problems which arise when churches of varying faiths unite. For instance,

[19] Writer's *Questionnaire.*
[20] *Handbook of Community Church Movement*, p. 23.

the matter of the pastor's ecclesiastical connection is fixed. Moreover, only one membership roll has to be kept, contributed funds may be handled as a unit, missionary contributions go thru accredited channels, and the general form of worship and the educational literature take on a definite stamp.

Affiliated Type

The fourth type of united church, termed the "Affiliated" by Miss Hooker, is numerically the smallest of the group.[21] It is "a church related to a denominational body for certain specific purposes, but independent of it in all other respects". The specific purposes for this ecclesiastical connection are listed thus: the securing of accredited ministers; the inspiration which comes from belonging to a larger group; the provision of channels for missionary funds; the assistance of denominational experts in advice as to church methods. Aside from this loose connection with some chosen denomination, the churches of this group do not differ from those of the other types. So similar are they to the denominational churches that they have been classed as a part of them by some investigators.

The 977 united churches listed by the Institute are distributed among these various types as follows: 312 belong to the federated group; 137 are undenominational; 491 are denominational; and 37 are classified as affiliated. In this distribution it is seen that the denominational group is by far the largest. This is slightly different from the list assembled by the writer. These

[21] *United Churches*, pp. 98–99.

are distributed among the three types as follows: 67 federated; 24 denominational; and 15 only, undenominational. In the case of the list procured from the editor of *The Community Churchman*, 395 are undenominational; 390 federated; 424 denominational; while 83 are unclassified.

Merits of These Churches

This has an important bearing upon certain criticisms which have been brought against these churches. They were all deprived of the inspiration and enthusiasm which accompanies a conscious union with a larger group, it was said. Moreover, it has been held against them that instead of really serving as a uniting bond among the already numerous Protestant denominations, they were in danger of giving rise to still another denomination—that of the "United" or "Community" church. But in view of the above facts neither of these adverse criticisms seems to be just. It is hard to believe that another denomination will result when over 75% of all such churches have definite denominational connections. Neither is the inspiration which comes from being a unit in a larger organization lacking to any great extent, when this same percentage evidently enjoys it.

The number of denominations which have furnished the units of combination in these churches is eighteen in the case of the 106 churches of the writer's list and identically the same in the case of the 977 churches of the Institute's list; but the writer has been unable to discover whether or not these are the same eighteen.

By a comparison of his list with information on this point given in *United Churches*, it is shown that the Northern Baptist, the Methodist Episcopal, the Congregationalist and the Presbyterian in the U. S. A. denominations furnished by far the largest number of units in every type of united church. In the case of the writer's list, of the 142 units comprised within the 67 federated churches, 112 were furnished by these four denominations; of 58 units in 24 denominational churches, they supplied 46; while of the 35 units in 15 undenominational churches, they furnished 24. In the case of 643 units constituting 303 federated churches listed by the Institute, these same four denominations supplied 570, leaving only 73 units to be distributed among fourteen other denominations.

This is a matter of interest. For one thing, it shows that immersionist Christians can be brought to co-operate with non-immersionists. Furthermore, it reveals the fact that the liturgical denominations are the most difficult, after all, to get actually to co-operate with others, no matter what may be the vociferous claim of some of them in behalf of interdenominational union.[22] Finally, the most important fact revealed by this ratio of four denominations to 75% of the units of these uniting churches, is the possible far-reaching influence upon the future development of the community church movement. Considered in the light of the existing state of co-operation among these denominations in the Federal Council and the Home Missions

[22] Three liturgical denominations furnished only 13 units of a total of 643 which combined to form 303 federated churches, as pp. 39–40 of *United Churches* testify.

Council, there is ground for holding that they may bring the "united church" movement increasingly under their influence, thereby giving to it proper and wise direction.

Solving the Town and Country Problem

But the chief significance which a study of the "united church" movement brings to light is the very definite contribution it is making in overcoming some of the defects which have been shown to spring in large measure from denominational competition in the town and country areas. The mere fact that of the united churches where exact location was known, 934 were in population centers of 5,000 and under, is greatly in their favor as a means of solving the over-churched problem. Their popularity in small communities is attested by the fact that 581 of the 934 were located in villages of 250–2,500 inhabitants, 317 were in hamlets of 280 people and in the open country, while only 36 were found in towns of 2,500–5,000.[23] While it is possible to over-church a city beyond any reasonable basis, as, for instance, Pittsburgh, Pa., with a church for every 900 of its population, still, there is always present a reasonable hope for growth in population in the case of cities. But in the towns and hamlets with their stationary or declining population, denominational churches suffer for lack of support.[24] It is in such communities that some form of the united churches frequently saves not only the organized expression of Christianity for the people, but also the remnant of the churches for their denomina-

[23] *United Churches*, p. 290.
[24] Condition amply discussed in chapter V.

tions. In 10% of the replies to the writer's questionnaire of 1918, occur such statements as these: "Thru removals the local churches were forced to close, and thus the community church was started"; "The denominational church could not survive here, until it was placed upon an interdenominational basis"; "The two weak churches united; result, a going concern". The hold which this movement has taken upon the Christians of some of these smaller communities is brought to light in a humorous, and in some instances, a pathetic manner. For example, one pastor wrote in explanation of the formation of the denominational united church which he served, the following: "This church was founded thru an 'Act of God'. This is the legal term for it. In the middle of the summer of 1915 a tornado visited the district, wrecking the Baptist building, damaging the Methodist, leaving the Lutheran standing securely. This condition set a question in the mind of some of the parishioners which was as follows: 'Why three churches?' Within a year sentiment had ripened, . . . it was decided to unite forces. Then came the question: 'What denomination shall we ally ourselves with?' . . . Finally a public meeting was held, and by a majority vote it was decided to petition the Presbytery to take this matter in hand. In due time that body took action and our congregation was officially constituted a church of the Presbyterian U. S. A." Tho it is true that the Baptist church in this particular instance has withdrawn and built its own church again, the other two—the Methodist Episcopal and Lutheran—are still federated. In such a case (and it can be re-

peated in principle many times), there is a burning desire to escape from a multiplicity of local churches. That it is a "burning" desire is evident in that these churches were willing to sacrifice all their past denominational training for the sake of unity.

They Do Better Work

But why shouldn't they? The united churches are stronger and do a better work in many particulars than the denominational churches which are located in the town and country sections. Take, for example, the matter of the average total expenditure of money. That for all the town and country churches which have been surveyed by the Institute is $1,870, while the united churches average $2,748. Moreover, the average per capita expenditure, counting the total membership of churches of these two general groups was, for the denominational churches, $15.69; for the united churches, $21.72. For their purely local budget the denominational churches average $1,288, while the average of the united churches amounts to $2,306, showing again that the latter class of churches goes ahead of the former. It is not surprising in the light of these expenditures to learn that the salaries of the ministers of the united churches are larger than those of the strictly denominational churches. The average are $1,456 for the former; $839 for the latter.[25] Of the 106 churches in

[25] All of these facts are calculated on the basis of information given on pp. 114–118, *United Churches*, compared with data on the same point given in *Diagnosing the Rural Church* by Frey, *American Agricultural Villages* by Brunner, Hughes and Patten, and *Town and Country Churches* by Brunner.

the writer's survey the average in the case of 61 which gave the information was $1,143, ranging among the types as follows: federated churches paid an average of $1,260; denominational, $1,080; and the undenominational, $1,090. Very naturally the amount of salary paid the minister has its bearing upon resident pastorates. The united churches surpassed the denominational churches in this respect anywhere from 20 to 50%.[26]

Their Support of Missions

One criticism always made of united churches is that they are not good supporters of Christian missions; certainly not as good as the purely denominational church. In a measure this is true. But even on this point, when the facts are known, the weight of much of this criticism is greatly lessened. For example, the writer's questionnaire collected information concerning this matter for 51 federated, 20 denominational, and 10 undenominational types of united churches, and of the first-named class, 10 reported that they were giving the same amount as before federation; 41 reported that their offerings to missions had been increased. Of the second class, two gave nothing; two experienced no change; and 16 had increased their beneficence gifts. Of the third type, four gave nothing; one gave less, but five gave more than before union. The most exhaustive comparison of the purely denominational churches with united churches on this point is again that made by the Institute.[27] It shows that while the former class of

[26] *United Churches*, p. 200.
[27] Hooker, *United Churches*, pp. 119–121.

churches gives to benevolence 31% of the total amount of money raised, the latter class gives only 15.5%. This means, naturally, a smaller per capita giving on the part of their respective memberships. It reveals a weakness in the life of the united churches; that cannot be denied. But certain aspects of the situation must not be lost sight of. For one thing, almost every denomination has its own churches which are not giving anything for missions. Of 2,325 Baptist churches of North Carolina, 544 gave nothing during 1925 toward missionary expansion. There were 6,000 Baptist churches in the Southern Convention which gave nothing for this same year to the support of the missionary program.[28] To say the least, this sets before us the fact that the non-missionary spirit characterizes other than united churches.

There is, however, this encouragement regarding the united churches, namely, those which are linked with denominations give a higher percentage to missions than the purely undenominational churches, and since an increasing number of the latter are being led to form definite denominational connections, they may be counted on to make definite progress in their gifts to benevolence. But most important of all is the fact that the united churches, in raising more money and spending a larger percentage of it on themselves, are thereby relieving the home mission boards from so much support of them. Of 600 churches which were units in the

[28] From the speech of the state secretary at the N. C. Baptist Convention at Wilmington, N. C., Nov., 1926.

formation of united churches of which the facts were learned, 166 had received mission aid just before union. Partial information secured showed that at least 93 churches aided before union were no longer aided in 1923–1924. "Twelve churches, aid to which stopped at union, had been subsidized for an average of twenty-four years, eight having received aid for more than twenty years, and one for forty-seven years. Since the total sum that had been expended on these churches was $58,749, these few cases of union had resulted in no small economy of home mission funds." [29] This must be kept in mind if we are to evaluate rightly the status of the missionary spirit in these churches. Even tho in many cases to-day, officials of home boards are offering monetary aid as an inducement to some of their weak churches to federate, there is still a saving,[30] for when they unite, there is an increase of gifts to benevolence. For instance, the combining elements of 167 federated churches gave the year before union $65,034; the same churches, united, gave for the year 1923–1924, $108,089, a gain of $43,055.[31] While the showing for the other types is not as good as for that of the federated, it does go to prove that they do as much or more than did the units working separately. The withdrawal of aid from 200 competing churches in one denomination was brought about during one year by a general scheme of intra- and interdenominational co-operation.[32]

[29] *United Churches*, pp. 265–267.
[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 267–268.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[32] *The Christian Century*, October 7, 1926.

Enlarged Local Program

But the chief worth of the united churches is revealed in the larger program they provide, and the inspiration and enthusiasm engendered thru a union of forces on the local fields. The writer's questionnaire contained striking confirmation of these points. For instance, as regards the attendance upon the services of worship, seventy-seven churches stated it had increased—100% in some cases; four reported it was the same; while only three said it was not as good. The remaining 22 gave no reply covering this item. The attendance in the Sunday school likewise had increased in the case of 68 churches; nine reported it the same; and only three that it had fallen off. The other twenty-six churches made no answer regarding this point. If in numbers there is inspiration, 75% of these churches were blessed by it after the union, to an extent which they had not known before. Forty-nine churches reported that the increase in offerings to missions, pastor's salary, attendance upon worship and the Sunday school were greater than the combined efforts of the individual units before union; in the case of ten only was this not true.

Again, thru the union of these weak churches an improved program is generally set up. An illustration of this is furnished by a community church located "in a community consisting of 220 families, covering eleven square miles, and having one little village. There were formerly twenty-four churches in this area representing eleven denominations". Then, finally, came "a com-

munity church" with the following ideals. "It must be one with sectarianism buried; second, it must present and practice the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ and really vitalize men, building them into a living brotherhood; it must serve the community in progressive, vital building as one institution among many others working toward the same end." In order to do this the following activities were undertaken: (1) "Evangelism was accepted as the heart of the task, but the evangelistic program had for its fundamental object the making of community and world builders and not mainly the lengthening of the church roll." (2) Community service was taken up by the young people and resulted in providing a social center consisting of a reading-room, a library, and a restroom. These were free to all. (3) The young people substituted amateur plays and other amusements for questionable moving pictures and vaudeville performances. (4) The adults took advantage of the extension lecture service of state universities and secured free lectures on many subjects vital to life, such as health, sanitation, and tuberculosis, lectures to men by physicians, lectures on rural schools, scientific farming, community building, and special lectures of interest to the young people. (5) A Farmers' Club was formed. Its program included the consideration of such subjects as good roads, consolidation of schools, social reforms, scientific farming, farm co-operation, providing adequate intellectual stimulus, social and recreational life, sanitation, and making the home and country beautiful. (6) A pipe organ was secured by the enthusiastic contributors of the whole

community. These activities were made possible by the union of the eleven denominations in the community. A further result was a church of 360 co-operating workers instead of 250 contending sectarians. Moreover, instead of several little Sunday schools enrolling less than 200, there were over 500 enrolled in the one church. The funds for meeting all expenses were raised by "a community budget method", and "no collections are taken at the church".[33]

The claim is not made that all united churches have such a program as this concrete example affords, nor are they as wisely and successfully managed in every case. The point is this: such a program is possible in every community, but it can be realized only thru the union of the Christian forces. Moreover, to build a community spirit is of itself one of the greatest needs of the day in the towns and hamlets. To this end the united churches contribute far better than competing sectarianism can ever do.

The Movement in the South

In the book *United Churches*, to which reference has so often been made in this chapter, there were no data given which covered churches located in the southern states including Missouri. "The south was omitted because it had so few united churches." Missouri was left out also, "except for a single case surveyed".[34] However, in the list of such churches recently procured from *The Community Churchman* one hundred and fifteen

[33] Zumbrunnen, *The Community Church*, pp. 103–114.
[34] *United Churches*, Introduction, p. x.

were located in this field.[35] An additional questionnaire by the author sought for the purpose of this treatise to cover these churches. The information is given here in a condensed form, and in so far as possible, covers the main points discussed above.

To the one hundred and fifteen questionnaires sent out, forty-seven replies were received. Of these, fifteen were in no sense united churches, but strictly denominational in polity and program. The thirty-two remaining were distributed as follows: twelve from federated; thirteen from denominational; six from undenominational united churches; while one told of a failure in union effort. Of the thirty-one authenticated united churches, four originated prior to 1910; ten were formed between 1910–1920; thirteen from 1920–1926; while four gave no information as to date of origin.

The units involved in their formation were furnished by a total of fifteen different denominations distributed as follows: twelve were from the Baptist; twenty-four from the Presbyterian (North, South, and Cumberland); eighteen from the Disciples; seven from the Christian; three from the Episcopal; three from the Lutheran; one each from the Methodist Protestant, Free Methodist, Reformed, Quaker, and Unitarian denominations. This reference to the combining units should not be interpreted to mean that in every particular it was an organized church which entered into combination. As far as the information was clear on this point, that happened in about 50% of the cases, altho not one of the combining units furnished by the Episcopal,

[35] See above, p. 180.

Baptist, Unitarian, and Reformed denominations was at the time of combination an organized church. It is to be interpreted, however, to mean that in over 50% of the instances, people who were members of churches belonging to all these denominations became members of the united churches under the usual governing rules of membership of the various types to which they belonged. Fully one-third of these churches were located in sections of only one church, whose policy was to receive into its fellowship members from all evangelical denominations. Two of the number were sponsored by the business interests of the communities where they are located, as for instance, the oil and coal industries.

These churches run true to form as far as the size of the community where they are located is concerned. One was in a suburb of a city of 40,000 population; another in a suburb of a city of 8,000, "two miles distant from the nearest church"; one occupied an unchurched area (save for itself) in a city of 11,000; two were in towns of 5,000 population each; and two in towns of thirty-five hundred people each. Of the remaining twenty-four two only were located in towns of over 2,000; five in towns of 1,000–2,000; three in villages of 500–1,000; twelve were in hamlets of 80 to 500 people. Two did not give the information in question.

Twenty-three of them had full-time resident pastors; four had one-half time resident pastors (i. e. the pastor lived in the community where the church was located, but was shared with outlying stations). Four never furnished any information on this point. Nineteen reported that since the formation of the union, the salary

of the minister had been increased; six reported that it totaled the same as that paid by the different combining units. Six failed to give information about it.

The influence which combination had upon the program and work of these churches may be estimated in part by the following facts. The gifts for beneficence had been increased in the case of thirteen; had remained the same for eleven; while seven made no report on this point at all. Sixteen had enjoyed an increase (running as high as 100% in some cases) in attendance upon the church services; nine had experienced no change; while nine made no report. Nineteen had greatly increased Sunday school attendance; six could see no change; and seven failed to report.

What Their Pastors Say

Perhaps one of the most important results of this questionnaire is the information furnished by the pastors themselves touching the place and function of federated, union, and community churches in solving the problem of denominational rivalry and competition in the town and country areas. It stands to reason that the men who are actually engaged in the leadership of such churches are the ones best qualified to evaluate them as far as the practical results gained are concerned. All of the replies received came from pastors who were on the field. Twenty-three said that the united effort had been very successful in the particular local churches which they were serving, and they believed the "united" church movement was making the best contribution that we have toward a solution of Protestantism's de-

nominational rivalry and competition. They differed regarding what is the wisest method to be used in forming combination churches. Some thought the largest church in a community should furnish the uniting bond—the weaker ones joining with it. Others felt that the principle of federation, which allowed the combining units to retain their own denominational affiliations, was best. But despite this variety of opinions about "methods", they were unanimous in affirming that the movement itself they believed to be a healthy sign of present-day Protestant church life—one from which they anticipated ever-increasing beneficial results. Also, they were one in saying that a pressing need is for the Home and State Board officials to co-operate with this movement by using it with all its possible advantages, rather than by opposing it as some do, thereby fostering the spirit of ultra-sectarianism and making it impossible for weak churches to find a solution of their particular problems.

Benefits of Ecclesiastical Connection

Finally, an important conclusion forced upon one by his study of the united church is that some denominational connection contributes greatly to its prosperity. This is shown by the fact that of the churches which report progress in attendance, pastor's salary, and benevolence offerings, by far the larger number belong to the federated or denominational classifications—both of which retain an ecclesiastical connection with a larger body. Why this is true may be difficult of explanation. The following suggestions are given for what they may

be worth. For one thing, these churches being in the experimental stage, their membership, as far as it has had training in church work at all, has had it under denominational auspices. Furthermore, since so much depends upon the type of leadership a church enjoys, and a trained leadership is more often denominational than otherwise, the churches connected with some one or more present-day denominations are thereby the better assured of pastors who are trustworthy leaders. These two suggestions are easily paralleled by another, to wit, the less distinct the break with one's religious past, the more certain will be the possibility of progress whatever change is made. But whatever the operating causes, facts seem to show that the united churches having a denominational connection are superior to others and more progressive both in spirit and vision.

CHAPTER IX

CO-OPERATION AND FOREIGN MISSIONS

The Task too Great for Any One Sect

For a number of years foreign missionaries, leading secretaries of foreign boards, and native Christians in mission lands have been advocating a closer interdenominational co-operation among the western Protestant missionary forces sent to foreign fields. One reason they assign for this is the sheer magnitude of the task involved. Neither any one denomination alone, nor any two or three of them together, can hope to supply either the men or money sufficient to reach the one thousand million people of the non-Christian world. The Bishop of Albany, with respect to his own denomination, has emphasized this as follows: "If we were large enough and liberal enough as a church to assume responsibility for preaching the gospel to every creature there might be some excuse for our lack of recognition of those who, along lines that differ materially from our own, are nobly striving to carry the message of our Lord to those by whom it has not been heard. But while we are so very unequal to the task in numbers or in liberality, it seems to me impossible to hold aloof in our sympathy from those who with a profounder missionary zeal, are striving to do according to their own convictions

the work we are so largely neglecting." [1] Is there one of the Protestant denominations in America now carrying on foreign missionary work, to which these words of the English bishop would not apply? For instance, the largest foreign staff furnished by any one American denomination at work in the following countries supplies only one worker for each 500,000 people in India, one for each 1,000,000 in Japan, and one for each 700,000 in China.[2] To Christianize these countries with such a force, is, upon the face of it, an impossible task. The combined foreign staffs of the United States and Canada now employed in these same countries can supply only one missionary for each 120,000 persons in India, 80,000 in Japan, and 90,000 in China. Tho this increases notably the proportion of workers to population, still these fields are woefully undermanned. The foreign staffs of all Protestant denominations in mission fields supplies one missionary for each 36,727 persons in the non-Christian world, and, as distributed at present, one for every 65,000 in Asia, one for each 56,000 in India, 65,000 in Japan (including Korea and Formosa), and 52,000 in China. Tho that proportion of workers to population leaves much to be desired, nevertheless, it is such an improvement over all the previous calculations that one cannot fail to realize that the only ground for effectively manning the foreign mission fields is thru a combination of existing forces—a conclusion still further impressed upon us when it is known that the present

[1] Quoted by Robert E. Speer in *Christianity and the Nations*, p. 329.

[2] The Northern Baptist Forces in India, and the Presbyterian U. S. A. Forces in Japan and China. Facts taken from the *World Missionary Atlas*.

combined foreign and native missionary staffs give a worker for each 6,000 people in the non-Christian world, and as distributed at present, one for each 8,500 in Asia—6,000 in India, 8,000 in Japan, and 12,000 in China. Such facts testify to the remarkable vitality of the missionary cause, furnish the basis for a reasonable hope of Christianizing the world, thru a united effort, and make Dr. Mott's statement that a proper co-operation among Protestants "would without doubt lead to a speedy and complete occupation of the wide field" [3] seem conclusive. So, when an important American denomination prefers to work apart from others, tho it can supply only one missionary for every 3,600,000 people in Japan, none at all for Korea, one only to each 600,000 in China, and none at all in India, the folly of its course is evident.

Proportionate Share of Workers

Again, co-operation in foreign mission work is urged because a lack of it in the past has sent a disproportionate share of workers to special fields. A dozen years ago, of 1,178 missionaries in Japan, 60% were in eight cities, 323 being in Tokio; of 313 missionaries in the province of Chekiang, 126 were in Ningpo and Hangchow; and of 5,200 in India, 101 were in Madras and 137 in Calcutta. The *India Year Book* of that date reported that a survey of two-thirds of India showed that of 20,885 native and foreign Christian workers, 16,948, or four-fifths, were among one-fourth of the

[3] *The Present World Situation*, p. 159.

population.[4] Naturally, such an unwise distribution arises from the absence of co-ordination and co-operation applied to missionary forces. Each denomination craved to serve, and, no doubt, felt that in selecting the large centers of population it was following both the example of Paul—Christianity's greatest missionary—as well as the best logic of mission propaganda from the point of view of a single sect. However, we can hardly believe that, had Paul been directing an army of missionaries, he would have sent three-fourths of them to one-fourth of the population, or that we should adhere to the logic denominational rivalries force upon us, when, upon the premise of practical efficiency, that logic is proven erroneous.

Unification for Increased Power

Again, the impact of the foreign missionary forces will be greater when a unified and co-ordinated program is adopted. "On the mission fields as conducted at present one receives the impression that there are thirty or more separate armies, all moving toward a common goal, but without a common strategy." [5] The force of that remark is clear when we discover that there are now, including those of other countries as well as of United States, 380 boards and societies operating in the non-Christian world, which maintain nearly 30,000 foreign missionaries, and have a combined annual income of

[4] These figures are taken from *Unity and Missions*, pp. 40–41, by A. J. Brown. This work, published about twelve years ago, does not give the exact figures prevailing to-day, but the point it makes thru the above numbers has not changed in the past decade.

[5] John R. Mott, *The Present World Situation*, p. 159.

nearly $70,000,000. There are seventy American and Canadian societies at work in China, twenty-four British, and twenty Continental—one hundred and fourteen in all. In Japan there are thirty-eight American and Canadian boards, three British, two Continental—forty-three in all. In Bengal there are eleven American and Canadian societies, seventeen British, two Australian, and two Continental—thirty-two in all. In Madras, there are fourteen American and Canadian boards, seventeen British, and three Continental—thirty-four in all, In the Philippines there are fourteen American societies, one British, and one native—sixteen in all.[6]

To be sure, no one claims that the sum total of men and money of all these societies is too large for the work, but, since such facts as the above, in varying degrees, can be duplicated in almost every mission field, can it be questioned that the influence and power of these mission forces would be greater if, working harmoniously, they thus presented a united front to the mind of the non-Christian?

Viewed from Mission Lands

Approached from the side of the mission lands, we find that an interdenominational co-operation which submerges the sectarian differences of the West should be practiced, (1) in order that the essential gospel uncluttered by non-essentials may become the possession of the native Christians, (2) because, in surrounding, which at best are frequently hostile to the new religions

[6] *World's Missionary Atlas*, pp. 82 f.

the native Christians need the full force of a united front, and (3) to avoid curtailing in the slightest—thru the transference to the east of western customs and practices, many of which are meaningless in their new home—the liberty and privilege of the native Christians to build an indigenous Christian church to suit their own capacities and special needs.

It should be clear to all that the elemental need of non-Christian peoples is a knowledge of God the Father, who "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever trusts in him should not perish, but have eternal life".[7] Given that, they are in possession of the heart and core of the Christian message. To be sure, to lead the Christian converts of any land to regard themselves as Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalist, and what-not Christians may not prohibit the importation of that primary truth; but it does weigh that truth with factors confusing to the native mind. This is implied in the response of the Japanese nobleman, who, when asked to become a Christian, pointed to a score or more of denominational agencies with their homes on the public square in Tokio, and asked "which Christianity", and in the naïve question of the African, "Which is the greatest God, that of the Methodist, Baptist or Presbyterian?" "If we want to win the heathen world to Christ," said Phillips Brooks after his missionary tour around the world, "we must not go to them as Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, or Baptists; we must go to them simply as Christians." The Chinese

[7] John 3:16. Mrs. Montgomery's *Centenary Translation.*

Christians who laid down their lives by the thousand in the dreadful days of the Boxer riots, did not die for a form of baptism, a scheme of church government, a liturgy, or a theory of ecclesiastical orders: they died rather than to trample upon the figure of a rude cross traced on the ground.

Native Christians' Demand

Moreover, the native Christians need the power and prestige that go with a united church. Compared with the large number of non-Christian natives, the Christian converts appear, at best, very few. And naturally, a divided church, set down in a host of Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, or Confucianists, cannot feel itself as strong as would a united church. Again, the influence of a thousand Christians among one hundred thousand non-Christians will be measured about in proportion to the degree of love, respect, and spirit of unity manifest among themselves. Wherefore Bishop Selwyn affirms: "My observation covering one-half of the Pacific Islands has shown me that wherever this law of religious unity is observed there the gospel is in its full, unchecked, and undivided power." [8]

Finally, on no other basis than that of a co-operative mission program which exalts Christ while it refuses to impose the denominational shibboleths of occidental Protestantism upon the Christian people of eastern countries, does it seem possible to give the liberty the natives need, and in some instances are now demanding,

[8] Quoted by John R. Mott, *The Present World Situation*, p. 160.

to develop the type of Christian doctrine and church they desire. For years there has been a growing emphasis in mission lands for Christian union and co-operation. The India National Conference, meeting at Calcutta in 1912, said: "This Conference is of the opinion that there is undoubtedly a strong desire on the part of many of the leaders of the Indian Christian community for a comprehensive church organization, adapted to the country . . . and considers that every facility should be afforded for the spread and development of this desire in the Indian Christian community at large." [9] Native Japanese leaders, in conference in Tokio, April, 1913, said: "It is the sincere hope and earnest prayer of every Christian man and woman that all the churches representing Christianity in Japan may come together and be made one in Christ, with one faith, one order, and one work." The National Conference in Japan adopted the following resolution: "This Conference would put on record its profound gratitude to God for the very large means of Christian fellowship and of the observance of the principle of comity and co-operation on the part of the churches and missions of Japan . . . and records its conviction that the most effective promoting of the Kingdom of God in this land calls for wider application of these principles." [10] The Chinese expressed themselves in the following vigorous manner: "We seek first the Kingdom of God. All organizations even including the church are put secondary . . . . The power of the church will grow as it

[9] *Library of Christian Co-operation*, Vol. V, pp. 302–303.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 305 f.

synchronizes its operation with the Kingdom, and learns to work in regulated and co-operative activity." [11]

This same general attitude is reflected in the report of the committee on the Indigenous church, when it declares: "Has not the time come when the Chinese church should cease to regard itself as dependent for its life and development upon the right of religious liberty originally secured under the treaties? Should it not now assert its religious freedom as guaranteed by the constitution of the Republic of China? . . . The present situation created in part by the anti-Christian movement has made it apparent that there is still a great lack of effective Chinese leadership in the church. In spite of the increasing number of positions of prominence open to Chinese, the policy and plans for Christian work continue to such an extent to be determined by others as to retard unduly the development of actual Chinese leadership. . . . Careful inquiry should be made as to ways by which financial support from churches abroad can be continued without being conditioned on foreign control." [12] The Ling Tong letter voices even more strongly the same sentiment. In it, after expressing their gratitude for the work of Christian missions in their midst for the last sixty to seventy years, these South China Christians go on to say that they cannot longer endure such terms as "foreign slaves" and to have their church called "factories for the production of 'homeless slaves' ", so they wish to remedy the situation by hav-

[11] *Report.* Shanghai Centenary Missionary Conference.

[12] The National Christian Council of China for 1925, as reported by J. S. Kunkel, *The Christian Century*, Aug. 1, 1925.

ing "the planning and administration of the work in all phases handed over to the Chinese Christians". Continuing, they declare, "under present circumstances the Ling Tong Baptist churches find it necessary to request financial aid but such aid not conditioned upon foreign control".[13]

Attitude of Missionaries

Fortunately, this desire on the part of the oriental to "work out his own salvation in fear and trembling", meets the approval of those who are in a position to know what is best. A former missionary to China declares of it: "The national mind of China and India, as of Japan, spurns a foreign-controlled religion. Foreign-controlled institutions cannot hope to hold the allegiance of eastern peoples. It looks like a foreign allegiance, however much we wish it otherwise, and that to them is intolerable." [14]

An active missionary delivers himself as follows: "I am frank to say I would not turn over my hand to Westernize the East, but I trust that I would give my life to Christianize it. . . . We want the East to keep its own soul—and only thus can it be creative. We are not there to plaster western civilization upon the East, to make it a pale copy of ourselves. We must go deeper—infinitely deeper—than that. Again, we are not there to give its people a blocked-off, rigid, ecclesiastical and

[13] Letter published in the *Watchman-Examiner*, Nov. 12, 1925. Dr. J. H. Franklin states it may become a historic document. It was sent to the Foreign Missionary Society of the Northern Baptist Convention.

[14] Mr. Robert E. Lewis, in *The Outlook*.

theological system, saying to them 'take that in its entirety or nothing'. Jesus is the Gospel—he himself is the good news. . . . Some of our ecclesiastical systems built upon a controversy lose meaning when they pass over into a totally different atmosphere. But Jesus is universal. He can stand the shock of transplantation. He appeals to the universal heart." [15]

Upon what better basis than that of the privilege to accept the Gospel of Christ—then by, and thru, its leading, to solve their own peculiar religious problems—can the eastern Christians be treated? That gives them the opportunity to be creative. It is only giving them the same privilege which the majority of western Protestants, and especially Americans, exercised. Furthermore, as another pertinently asks, "Where in the Bible can we find any statement that God gave to the people of the United States, or of Germany, the final authority to state what rites are to be used for church membership in another continent?" [16]

Some Notable Achievements

In view of the above one is not surprised to learn that much has already been accomplished—in the line of co-operation and exercise of comity principles—on the part of the various mission boards working in the foreign field. For several months in 1917, Rev. Samuel Guy Inman, working in Latin America under instructions from the Committee of Co-operation, labored among

[15] Rev. E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, pp. 31–33.
[16] Frank C. Laubach of Manila, P. I., in a letter published in *The Christian Century*, Sept. 16, 1926.

the missionary forces with the success evident in the fact that, among many other specifically detailed matters, the complete organizations of Regional Committees in the various countries was effected and an actual beginning of the following co-operative movements made:

Mexico. A union theological seminary, a union printing plant, and union depository and paper, delimitation of territory.

Cuba. A union depository, allocation of a missionary for secretary of the committee on conference in Cuba, a better distribution of forces, a co-operative social service program.

Panama. An international union Christian college, a better division of work.

Peru. A division of the field into three parts among the three societies, a union paper, a union theological seminary.

Bolivia. A division of territory, a participation with Peru in the union paper, and a union seminary.

Chile. An interdenominational academy for the education of the church's children, a union normal school, a strengthening of the union paper and the union theological seminary, a union depository at Santiago.

Argentina. A union depository in Buenos Aires, a union educational work, and a division of territory between the Methodists and the Disciples of Christ.

Brazil. A union theological seminary, a union depository, and a university federation of the evangelical schools in Brazil.

Porto Rico. A missionary giving all his time to the secretaryship of the committees on co-operation in Porto

Rico, a union paper, a union depository, and several interdenominational enterprises.[17]

Another aspect of comity on the mission field is territorial delimitation. This, perhaps, is one of the oldest forms of co-operation, for the American Board of Conference on Foreign Missions in 1838 "reserved that the Board respectfully suggest and recommend wherever a society contemplated operation that it be deemed suitable that the societies whose missionaries are already in the field be apprised of the fact and be consulted before such operations are commenced",[18] and Bishop Selwyn of the Pacific Islands fifty or more years ago carried out a policy of territorial delimitation which has prevented strife up to the present day. In Korea in 1909, a committee appointed by the missions chiefly involved met and settled upon a plan by which mutual concessions were made and the territory fully divided.[19] Similar schemes are in vogue in China and India. One of the most effective instances of territorial division is that prevailing in the Philippines, where Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodist Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and the United Brethren are developing distinct fields, and a united church front is thus presented, so well that the different churches scarcely know there is more than one Protestant church.[20]

Then, experience has shown the great advantage in interdenominationally controlled printing work, or such an arrangement that a printing society under a single

[17] A. G. Inman, *Christian Co-operation in Latin America*, pp. 34–35.
[18] *World Missionary Conference*, 1910, Vol. VIII, pp. 13–14.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.
[20] *Ibid.*, Vol. V., p. 14.

denomination may work for all. Hence, interdenominational Bible, tract, and Christian literature printing societies are functioning in Japan, Korea, China, and India.

Again, denominations have co-operated in evangelistic work in Japan, China, India, Africa, and some of the Latin-American countries. At Sao Paulo in 1917, the churches of all denominations rented the largest auditorium in the city for their union meetings, and with the preaching of the local pastors shook the whole community. "Where personal and denominational differences have disturbed the work, union efforts to save others will be the best way to serve the whole cause." [21] Dr. E. Stanley Jones, during the summer and autumn of 1928, held a series of successful Union Evangelistic meetings in the Latin-American countries. Great crowds attended, some traveling for 500 miles.

The Field of Education

In addition, the field of education supplies striking instances of co-operation. Six British, six American and Canadian societies united in establishing the Christian College for Women in Madras in 1915. Four denominations from three nationalities are united in the work of the University of Chengtu, in western China. The Gingling College for Women was opened in 1915 at Nanking, as a union undertaking of the Baptist, Methodist Episcopal (North and South), Christian, and Presbyterian denominations, together with Smith College. Northern and Southern Baptists have joined in a union

[21] S. G. Inman, *Christian Co-operation in Latin America*, p. 162.

college at Shanghai. The Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian denominations are united in a college in Seoul, Korea, while the Northern and Southern Presbyterians in the United States have joined with the Canadian and Australian Presbyterians in a junior college at Pingyang. The Methodists, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians of England jointly carry on the Fukien Union College of Liberal Arts, as well as co-operate in Foochow Theological Seminary, Union Medical School and Union Training School for Teachers.

One of the foremost examples of union medical schools is the Union Medical College in Peking, with its faculty representing eleven different missionary societies and five distinct church organizations—Anglican, Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist. Other union medical colleges are located in Hangkow, Moukden, Tsinanfu, and Nanking—the third representing the English Baptists and American Presbyterians, and the last, Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists of the United States. An example of a school maintained by one society but serving all sects is that at Lovedale, South Africa, which, tho under the control of the United Free Church of Scotland, has trained students of every denomination in South Africa.

Interdenominational theological seminaries, or training schools for Christian workers are numerous. The Presbyterians and Methodists conduct one located in Manila; Northern and Southern Methodists with Canadian and Australian Presbyterians have one in Seoul; English and American Congregationalists with American Presbyterians conduct one in Peking; there is one in

Nanking under the joint control of Northern and Southern Methodists, Northern and Southern Presbyterians and Disciples; another in Shantung under the English Baptists and American Presbyterians; another in Bangalore is under two British and three American societies; still another in Canton represents three British and three American boards; and these by no means complete the list.

Economic Advantages

The economic advantage gained by this co-operative scheme of interdenominational education is clearly shown by reference to the situation in Peking where Methodists, Presbyterians, and English and American Congregationalists united in developing a single university comprised of a union arts college, a union teachers college, a union medical school, and a union theological seminary. The old plan of a strictly denominational program would have moved each sect to build one school each of these various types—sixteen in all; on the basis of co-operation there are four.

Other forms of co-operation on the mission field embrace the organic union of denominational family groups and of native Christian churches of varying sects. For example, of the former type may be named the Presbyterians in Japan and China, the Methodists (North, South and Canadian) in Japan and China, and the Lutherans in India. Illustrative of the latter are the South India Church, the Federation of Christian Forces in India, and the Christian Church of China.

The Reaction at the Home Base

Contemporaneously with this co-operative activity on the foreign field is seen a concurrent and reciprocal union movement among the foreign societies of the home base in the formation of interdenominational missionary conferences. The London Secretaries Association, which unites the secretaries of the various boards of the British Isles, is the oldest, dating its beginning from 1819. The Ausschuss der Deutschen Evangelische Missionen represents twelve leading German boards and deals with questions that arise among the societies themselves as well as those between the societies and the German Colonial Office. The Quadrennial Continental Conference is a type which embraces missionary board officials from more than one country. Its membership includes societies with headquarters in Germany, Denmark, Finland, France, Holland, Sweden, Norway and Switzerland.

Conference of Foreign Mission Boards

To this latter type also belongs the Conference of Foreign Mission Boards and Societies in the United States and Canada. As stated in its constitution its functions are "to provide for an annual conference of the Foreign Mission Boards and Societies of North America; to provide thru its committees for the investigation and study of missionary problems; to foster and promote a true science of missions and to perform itself, directly or thru its committees, certain specific work of interest to the Boards and Societies participating in the Conference. It is not within the scope of the

Conference to consider questions of ecclesiastical faith and order which represent denominational differences." [22]

At the session of the Conference held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, January 11–14, 1927, fifty-seven boards and societies were represented by the three hundred and fifty-two delegates in attendance. Reports from the far-flung missionary front were heard and the interests of Egypt, India, China, Japan, Africa, South and Latin America, and Mexico were seriously considered. The world changes now taking place, the need for a spiritual revival in the world-wide Christian church, the pressing demand for a better international and interracial spirit were discussed in the true spirit of Christian statesmanship. It is hard to envisage the contrast between such a gathering with its breadth of sympathy and outlook, with that of a purely denominational group of a few decades ago with its inevitably shorter reach and weaker powers.

The Ecumenical Missionary Conference of 1900 had its origin in the Conference of the Foreign Mission Boards of the United States and Canada. The Committee on Reference and Council, consisting of eleven members reports annually to the Conference. Its work is to cover (1) suggestions in regard to unoccupied fields; (2) questions that arise on the mission fields between missions of different boards; (3) original action in cases requiring immediate action and not involving matters of polity regarding which there may not be essential difference of opinion.

[22] *Report of Foreign Missionary Conference of North America*, 1917, p. 326.

Women's Board of Foreign Missions

Another interdenominational organization of importance is the Women's Board of Foreign Missions. It originated in 1900 and passed thru various stages of formation until, in 1913, "after three years of preliminary discussion the federation was finally organized with a general advisory commission and four territorial commissions with headquarters in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Nashville." Twenty boards belong to the federation, the purpose of which, as stated in its constitution, is "to stimulate united prayer and study and a spirit of fellowship of service, to secure a deeper realization of the whole task of foreign missions, a clearer understanding of the difficulties and problems, a fuller development of resources, and a truer conception of the dignity, scope and purpose of woman's work for missions." [23]

International Missionary Councils

However, the organization of supreme present-day and potential importance for interdenominational co-operation in foreign missions is, without doubt, the International Missionary Council. Its formation was delayed by the World War and only became an accomplished fact in 1920. But its sessions became of immediate and far-reaching significance. At the meeting of the Council in Oxford, England, 1923, there were eighty delegates present representing the missionary interests of twelve Christian nations and seven principal mission lands.

[23] *Library of Christian Co-operation*, Vol. V, p. 294.

At the session of the Council at Rattvik, Sweden, July 17–25, 1926, practically all of the regular members of the committees were present, and the churches of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the two Americas were again represented. The findings of the Conference dealt with such vital problems as (1) the need for a new tide of spiritual life to flood within the church before its missionary task can be fulfilled; (2) the need for a world-wide inquiry into the relation of the Christian message to the non-Christian system of thought and life; (3) the need for a re-examination and restatement of the relation of Christianity to the race problem; and (4) the necessity for attention to the problem of human relations to industry and labor in all lands.[24] At the latest session of the Council, held on the Mount of Olives, March 24 to April 8, 1928, there were two hundred and forty men and women present from fifty-one countries—or practically all Christian and non-Christian lands. While the Conference dealt with every vital phase of modern missionary enterprise, the two statements in its findings pertinent to this chapter are: "We do not go to the nations called non-Christian because they are the worst of the world . . . we go because they are a part of the world and share with us the same . . . need of redemption from ourselves and from sin, the need to have life complete and abundant after the pattern of Christ-likeness . . . . Christ belongs to the peoples of Africa and Asia as much as to the European or American." [25]

[24] Report of the Conference given in *The Christian Century*, August 26, 1926, which see for fuller account.

[25] From Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert's Report in *The Christian Century*, May 10, 1928.

That makes it clear that the missionary enterprise is reciprocal. Then this statement on co-operation: "It is our opinion that co-operation is not merely advisable or good but that it is a vital necessity to-day. The world is now organized internationally. Races and nations are interdependent and the outward unification of the world makes supremely important the spiritual unity of the church." [26] And that makes it clear where those at the forefront of missionary activity stand, relative to the problem of Christian co-operation. A great moment has arrived when representatives gathered from the large majority of Christian communions base the work of carrying the Gospel of Christ to the world on a united Christian church from all lands.

Attitude of Board Officials

The future of co-operation in foreign missions will, naturally, depend largely upon the attitude of the mission boards and their officials toward the movement. If they are favorable to the idea it will progress: if they are unfavorable, inevitably it will retrogress. Recognizing this, the writer sought thru a questionnaire to learn the facts. Thirteen replies came from nineteen distinctively foreign boards of as many denominations, and six replies came from denominations whose foreign and home work are carried on under one secretary—making a total of nineteen answers from ninety-one requests.

To the question: Is there any effort made to avoid overlapping of your Board's work with that of other denominational Boards working in the same territory?

[26] From Dr. William Axling's Report in *The Baptist*, June 9, 1928.

twelve gave a direct affirmative answer; six gave an answer in the affirmative with reservations; only one gave a decided negative.

To the question: What is the general position of your Board relative to the matter of interdenominational missionary activities? fifteen replies were strongly favorable; one favorably inclined with reservations; two strongly unfavorable; one did not answer.

We learn, therefore, that a large majority of foreign boards are both practicing interdenominational co-operation, and are committed definitely to such a policy. But we learn from reading the answers themselves something even more vital to the cause of union than mere numerical majority can carry. Some voice a decided positiveness on the matter. For instance, one says, "We believe in all sorts of interdenominational activities," or, as another, "We are committed to the policy heart and soul", or again, "We co-operate in every possible way with all other foreign missionary agents", or, as still another affirms, "always ready to join hands with others in advancing the Kingdom."

On the other hand, the boards which hold reservations have likewise very decided opinions and misgivings. One writes, "We unite as far as possible", while another contends "that our Board of Missions occupies a very conservative position with regard to the matter of interdenominational missionary activities" because of "the conviction of the members that such interdenominational activities are only occasionally successful."

It is in connection with the replies to the question: What is your personal opinion of the subject of denomi-

national co-operation in missionary work? that some of the strongest statements were made and most interesting situations revealed. Sixteen answers to the question were received: twelve in favor of the union and co-operative movement; three modified by certain reservations; one frankly opposed to it in any form. The last named said: "My observation is that most men, especially those who are blessed with a good degree of Christian sentiment, have confounded ordinary Christian relations with the matter of co-operation and federation". A representative answer of those who hold to reservations runs as follows: "My personal opinion is that theoretically a certain amount of co-operation is practicable and that it would be ideally correct. So long, however, as our respective communions retain their separate organizations and standards in this country I see little opportunity of much really effective or far-reaching co-operation abroad. . . . Until we succeed in realizing our hopes for Christian reunion I see little likelihood of our being able to co-operate in the important work of theological education".

Turning to the twelve replies favoring co-operation we find real enthusiasm expressed. "I believe in it with all my heart and soul," says one, and another declares "any other policy to be foolish and a sin". Touching on a specific point another says, "I think foreign territory should be parcelled out among Boards". The two replies which try to treat the matter fairly and with some degree of thoroughness are the following: "It is the only way to extend the Kingdom. One reason why the church of Christ has been making such slow progress

in Christian and non-Christian countries is due to the congestion of church buildings and ministers in certain lands. If there could be a sane distribution of the Christian forces all over the world the dream of many earnest souls might be realized—'the evangelization of the world in this generation'". The second most sensible and zealous reply runs: "proper maintenance of denominational independence and integrity should under present conditions be protected . . . but the stress if placed upon essentials and not upon non-essentials, would in a decade, produce, not the union of churches in one body, but a united Christianity with one heart and mind, a common program and constant progress and victory."

The Future for Co-operation

On the basis of these answers and their summaries two things are predominantly true. First, that the movement for co-operation and federation on the foreign field is a settled policy for a preponderantly large number of influential denominations, and second, that the secretaries of the boards concerned are very much in sympathy with it.

That there is much in behalf of unity on the foreign field still to be accomplished cannot be denied. Obstacles almost insuperable are still in the way, and only courageous souls are going to overcome them. Unity will not be gained by treating the differences which separate denominations as unimportant; rather, it is to be had in that higher point of view which transcends these divergences, and in which they are truly reconciled.

The Christian's common faith in God, common love for Christ, and common work for mankind embrace the true principle of that comprehension. On the basis of that policy there is reason to believe the steps toward co-operation already taken will become stepping-stones to that larger unity for which our Master prayed and the hearts of so many yearn to-day.

CHAPTER X

ADDITIONAL MOVEMENTS TOWARD CO-OPERATION

The trend toward Interdenominational Co-operation is not limited to the means and methods given in the preceding chapters. There are numerous accomplishments to credit to the desire for a closer union among the varying Protestant denominations to-day.

Some Instances of Union in Family Groups

The Lutheran Family Group. Five synods comprising six-sevenths of the Norwegian Lutherans in the United States have been brought together in the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, during the years 1890–1917. The Evangelical Synodical Conference of America, founded in 1872, united in a "common church life" involving doctrinal purity and uniformity of practice, the Synods of Missouri, Joint Wisconsin, Slovak, Evangelical Lutheran, and the Norwegian Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The United Lutheran Church in America, founded in 1918,[1] has brought under one general administrative control the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South, which had been the three largest and most influential bodies of the General Lutheran denomination, and it

[1] See Appendix A, p. 318.

now comprises nearly 800,000 members.[1a] There has also been formed the National Lutheran Council, a representative body which is an agency thru which fourteen of the total of sixteen Bodies or Synods of the Lutheran church co-operate under rules that guarantee "to each, rights, privileges and immunities of a free church". The three bodies, the Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo Synods, are now carrying on negotiations for a merger, tho it has not yet been accomplished. However, Dr. Carl Ackermann writes, "I believe all differences will be cleared up, and the merger will be consummated".[2] The various branches of this denomination in America are now joining with the Lutheran Church of all other countries in plans for a world's Lutheran convention to be held in 1929, which will be the 400th anniversary of the adoption of Luther's Shorter Catechism.[3]

The Presbyterian Family Group. This union-trend has also been operating to an advantage among the Presbyterian family denominations. As far back as 1782 the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church was formed by the union of two independent presbyteries, the Reformed and the Associate. In 1858 the Associate Synod (Secession and Covenanter) were brought together in the United Presbyterian Church of North America. (This latter effort at union would have done away with one of the Presbyterian groups, the Associate Synod, but for eleven ministers who refused to enter it.) In 1864 the Presbyterian Church South was

[1a] See Addenda, p. 327, "The Merging of Subsidiary Units."
[2] Letter to the writer of February 7, 1927.
[3] *The Christian Century*, July 26, 1923, and December 17, 1925.

formed by the union of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the Confederate States of America and the United Synod. This union was further enlarged in 1869 by the Synod of Kentucky, and in 1874 by the Synod of Missouri. Organic union was consummated in 1905 between the Cumberland Presbyterian and the Presbyterian Church North. Then in 1920 the Welsh Calvinistic Presbyterian church joined the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A., thereby reducing the division in this family group by one. While no scheme of organic union between the North and South branches of the Presbyterian denomination has been successful as yet, they have entered into comity agreements which will effectively lessen overlapping, etc.[4] One of the most significant union efforts in this family group, however, is that represented in the formation of an "Alliance or Council of Reformed churches thruout the world holding the Presbyterian system." The Synod of the Reformed Church in the U. S. in 1920 authorized negotiations with the Presbyterian U. S. A. with a view to the consolidation of the two bodies. The Presbyterian North and South, the United Presbyterian, and the Reformed Church in America are seeking closer relations. A tentative plan of union has been approved whereby a United Assembly is to be constituted with the title of "The United Assembly of the Presbyterian and Reformed churches in the United States of America." This movement gives hope that the leading Presbyterian and Reformed churches will be united in one Christian communion. The twelfth council of the Alliance of the

[4] See above, Chapter VII, p. 155.

Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system met at Cardiff, Wales, during a part of June and July, 1925. There were present 280 delegates representing forty-six denominations and twenty-four countries.[5]

The Baptist Family Group. In the case of the Baptist denomination the movement toward anything approaching organic union is slow, but there is evidence of a growing spirit of co-operation. The United Baptist group was formed thru the coming together of what were termed Separate and Regular Baptist churches. Since 1911 the Free Baptist churches in the area of the Northern Baptist Convention have been in process of merging with the latter group—while the General Conference of Free Baptists maintains a separate existence as a legal corporation, it meets only when called. In 1915 the General Association of the General Baptists formed a co-operative union with the Northern Baptist Convention. While there is no concrete administrative or federal form of union between the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions, there is a spirit of brotherliness and co-operation. Both of these Conventions are members of the Baptist World's Alliance, which comprises those of this denomination from all countries. This Alliance has served to create a sense of denominational solidarity thruout the world, and will, no doubt, serve increasingly to build the Baptist forces into a fellowship of friendly co-operation in matters of general and world-wide concern.

The Methodist Family Group. Of this family group the Methodist Protestant church holds the interesting position of having suffered a division in 1858, but of

[5] *The Christian Century*, August 13, 1925.

having enjoyed a reunion of the two branches again in 1877. The issue in the division centered around the question of slavery, and when that was settled for the country in 1861–1865, the breach in the denomination could be, and was, healed. But the effort at union among the Methodists which is of greatest importance concerns that of the two great Northern and Southern branches of this denomination. As far back as 1876 two Commissions, appointed by the respective General Conferences of the churches, drew up a "Declaration and Basis of Fraternity." This helped to clear away many misunderstandings and opened the door to further negotiations. Thru various stages the proceedings passed until, in 1924, both the M. E. church South, at Chattanooga, Tennessee, and the M. E. church North, at Springfield, Massachusetts, had endorsed officially the plan of union proposed by their Committee of Bishops. In the case of the former group, the vote stood 297 for and 95 against, while in the latter group it stood at 802 to 13 respectively. Then the Northern Conference voted to carry thru the project, but in the General Conference of the Southern church held in Memphis in 1926, the proposition for unification was voted back to a committee for further research and investigation. Whether the question can be revived again soon is doubtful, but at least the effort has been a notable instance of the strong desire for union. Its defeat so far has been caused by the southern branch. The Methodists have an Ecumenical Conference, however, which unites for consultation and practical co-operation all the Methodists of the world.

Other Typical Groups. Another instance of the family group union was that which took place between the Home and Foreign Missionary Work Society and the Christian Alliance for home work in 1895, which resulted in the formation of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Still one other belonging to this same sphere is that of the union of the German Evangelical Protestant Ministers' Association with the German Evangelical Ministers' Conference in 1911, to form the Evangelical Protestant Church of North America.

It is held by some, that before anything like a reunion of Protestants involving all denominations can take place, still further union and co-operation must characterize the various family groups. That this phase of the problem is an important one cannot be gainsaid. There is little objection raised to it. Even those who are not strongly in favor of co-operative effort betweeen denominations of different families, seem to be pretty generally in sympathy with it here. Again, the union into one body of all divisions in these family groups would go far toward creating a situation that would enable the denomination thus formed to speak with a clearer and more authoritative voice for the more typical interdenominational activities. But to wait for a complete union and reunion of all the branches of family groups into one denomination under their respective titles, before any effort at further interdenominational co-operation could be started would have prevented much that has been done in bridging sectarian chasms, as well as have delayed indefinitely the progress of the movements which are now under way. So, fortunately

for the general cause of co-operation, this has not been the guiding policy.

Some Proposals for Corporate or Organic Union Between Varying Denominations

The Philadelphia Plan. This originated in a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. in 1918, calling for a conference with other Protestant churches to consider and propose a plan for organic church union. In response to that invitation representatives of the Presbyterian and seventeen other denominations [6] met in Philadelphia in December of 1918 and unanimously adopted a report, the chief stipulation of which was to provide for an Ad Interim Committee, comprising at least one member from each participating denomination, whose duty, after studying certain existing forms of organic union, was to draw up a plan, or plans, for organic unity, to be presented before another interdenominational conference not later than 1920. This second conference was held in Philadelphia, February 2–6, 1920, at which time what is known as the Philadelphia Plan was adopted. The salient features of this Plan are the following: [7]

[6] Churches represented in this conference were the Armenian, Baptist, Christian, Christian Union of U. S., Congregational, Disciples, Evangelical Synod of North America, Friends (two branches), Methodist (Primitive), Methodist Episcopal, Moravian, Presbyterian in the U. S. A., Protestant Episcopal, Reformed Episcopal, Reformed in the U. S., United Presbyterian, Welsh Presbyterian. *Christian Unity*, p. 158, footnote.

[7] Appendix II, pp. 355–358, Christian Unity—Its Principles and Possibilities.

a. The title of the union formed is to be the "United Churches of Christ in America."

b. Each constituent church is to reserve the right to retain its creedal statement, polity, and mode of worship.

c. The United Churches of Christ in America is to act thru a Council, and such Commissions of Judicial Boards *ad interim* as the Council may appoint.

d. The Council has the privilege of promulgating its own by-laws and rules of procedure.

e. The constituent churches are to effectuate the decision of the Council, when the laws of a state, charter of a board, or other ecclesiastical corporation requires; but, except as limited by the plan, shall govern themselves under the existing denominational constitution.

f. The specific duties of the Council are: (1) to harmonize and unify the work of the united churches; (2) to consolidate work of missionary activities in overchurched areas as far as allowed by the laws of the land or of the denomination affected; (3) to decide on matters of mutual concern submitted to the Council by participating denominations.

This plan has the virtue of really seeking to unite existing denominations in a corporate unity such as has never before been attempted. As has been said, it seeks to go to the root of our present difficulty, namely, "the divided consciousness of the different churches themselves". It would enable one belonging to feel that he belongs to the one Church of Christ. But its strength is its weakness. That is, its proposals go so deep that

the denominations which originated the Plan have not agreed to a surrender of power which it demands. Before it can go into effect six denominations must assent to it, and this has not been accomplished to date. The situation at present seems to be that only one denomination has endorsed it—the Congregationalist. Of the state associations in this denomination (in 1923), 88% have voted approval, 2% have disapproved, while 10% have not yet acted upon it.[8] The Northern Baptists refused to send delegates to the 1920 conference which adopted the Plan, stating their reasons for such refusal, among other things, to be that there exists "no centralized body that could deliver Baptist churches to any merger or corporate unity".[9] The United Presbyterians, at their Annual Assembly in May, 1920, withdrew their participation in the movement, but retained it in the Federal Council, saying that the latter organization was a sufficient step toward union, and included the former. The Ad Interim Committee of this movement is still in existence.

The Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Since 1801, when these two denominations formulated a "Plan of Union", which applied chiefly to home missionary soil, and was worked successfully in the smaller communities and frontier sections until it was set aside in 1837, there have been from time to time proposals of union between them. But partly because of so much theological discussion within their own ranks, together with the militant

[8] From report of the National Council of Congregational churches held in Springfield, Massachusetts, October 16–23, 1923.

[9] From Resolution passed at Denver Convention, in 1919.

opposition of the more conservative element toward such a union, the effort to unite these two denominations is at a practical standstill. The chief accomplishment, perhaps, is the Cleveland Plan of Union, officially endorsed at the General Assembly in 1925. This provides "that the Presbytery of Cleveland and other Presbyteries and Synods where the situation is similar, be encouraged to work out plans for co-operation and union in their local areas, as a demonstration of the practical operation of united churches within their bounds, subject to the counsel of the department of church co-operation, and that report be made to the next General Assembly".

The Congregationalists and Universalists. A recent step toward a form of co-operation which, if adopted by the authoritative bodies of the respective denominations, may eventuate in their organic union, is the proposal drawn up by the joint Commissions of the Congregationalists and Universalists appointed at their latest National Assemblies. The recommendations of this proposal which are especially pertinent to the point here are the following: [10]

1. That the ministers and representative of each denomination be invited to sit as corresponding members in the local, state, and national associations of the other denomination and to participate in their deliberations.

2. That the agencies of each denomination in the realms of religious education, social service, evangelism, rural church development, and similar problems, be

[10] Reported in *The Christian Century*, March 3, 1927.

urged to arrange for joint programs for promotion as far as practicable.

3. That in each community where churches of both denominations are found, they be urged to study what they can do together with mutual profit by way of union services, the interchange of pulpits, and the promotion of common enterprises.

4. That there be a mutual interchange of representative speakers at national, state, and local gatherings.

5. That the denominational journals be urged to make the largest practicable interchange of editorials and of printed matter of common interest, in order that each constituency may be kept fully informed regarding the other, and of the progress made in the direction of closer fellowship.

6. That, in order to secure more thoroughly co-ordinated movements, no actual steps toward the organization of local Congregational and Universalist churches be made without consulting their respective commissions.

7. Wherever the problem of an adequate church constituency presses for solution, and in any community where denominational divisions work for wastefulness, those responsible are urged to co-operate in organizing for more effective service.[10a]

One other proposal, or suggestion of co-operation, of this same general nature is the following: At the General Conference of the Evangelical Church held at Williamsport, Pa., in 1926, Bishop William M. Bell, senior Bishop of the United Brethren church, was present as a fraternal

[10a] See Addenda, p. 327, "The Christian Church and Congregationalists."

delegate, and spoke in behalf of the organic union of the two bodies. His suggestions were cordially received, and there is ground for hope that these two bodies may eventually work out a plan of union.[11]

The World Conference on Faith and Order. In 1886, the House of Bishops of the General Convention of the Episcopal church, which was then meeting in Chicago, issued a Declaration Concerning Unity, which called forth a committee "to consider the matter of the reunion of Christendom." In its accepted report, this committee set forth the following four points (hence its name, "Quadrilateral"), as being "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom:

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the revealed word of God.

"2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

"3. The two sacraments, baptism and the Supper of the Lord, administered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

"4. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

This Declaration, with slight modification, was adopted by the Lambeth Conference of the English church in 1888.[12] Then in 1908, the Anglican Bishops in an Encyclical Letter declared that they desired "not com-

[11] *The Christian Century*, November 4, 1926. There is a movement to unite the Congregationalists and the Christian Church (American Christian Convention).

[12] Hence its title, "Chicago-Lambeth" or "Lambeth Quadrilateral".

promise, but comprehension; not uniformity, but unity ", and requested by resolution that "meetings of ministers and laymen of different Christian bodies be held at different centres to promote a cordial mutual understanding". In response to the Encyclical Letter, the General Conference of the Congregationalists of Connecticut, in November, 1908, appointed a committee to further such conferences, and report concerning the relations of the different Christian bodies at its next annual meeting. This committee held an informal conference with some leading representatives of the Episcopal church at Hartford, Connecticut, May 5, 1909, which resulted in the offering of certain methods of approach toward unity that involved, among other things, action "to render the existing ministry of other churches regular according to the Episcopal order, and possessed of full authorization to minister the sacraments in Episcopal churches". [13]

The matter rested here until 1910, when the National Council of Congregational churches by a rising vote passed a resolution in response to the Encyclical Letter, which states, among other things, that "we on our part would seek, so much as lieth in us, for the unity and peace of the whole household of faith . . . and the Council would put on record its appreciation of the spirit and its concurrence in the purpose of this expression of the Lambeth Conference, and voice its earnest hope for a closer fellowship with the Episcopal church in work and worship." The Congregationalists also appointed

[13] Quoted by Walker and Smyth, *Approaches toward Christian Unity*, p. 148.

a special committee, "to consider any overtures that may come to our denomination as a result of these conferences."

A copy of these resolutions was dispatched to the Episcopal church, then meeting in its General Convention, and, by a singular coincidence, was received just after the latter had taken action to appoint a joint Commission to arrange for a World Conference on Faith and Order. In the same year, the General Convention of the Disciples at Topeka, Kansas, formed an organization which took the name, "Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity", the resolution providing for this organization authorizing the Association to "recognize all Christians as members of the body of Christ—Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestants, and all others who accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior." [14] Soon after the above actions were taken, the Alliance of Reformed churches thruout the world, holding the Presbyterian system, signified their approval of a world conference for the study of the reunion of Christendom.

It is from the above actions, initiated by the Episcopal church, that the World Conference on Faith and Order arose. And, as this shows, while it grew out of the original Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, coupled with the appeal for such a conference on the part of the Episcopal church in 1910, the soil for its reception had been simultaneously prepared by several denominations.

[14] The Episcopal Resolution of 1910, used the phrase "all Christian communions thruout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior". (Official Pamphlet, p. 15.)

The method pursued by this proposal is that of study and conference. It declares that, "the main task before us in these years of preparation is to understand and attain the true conference spirit. That means no surrender, no compromise, no abandonment of the eternal and unchanging Faith." [15] Again it affirms, "We are not to come to the Conference 'wholly unprejudiced', as that term is commonly used by unthinking persons, but with that earnest confidence in our conviction which is the mark of reason, and which, tho it may seem to be a kind of prejudgment, is really but a first step toward a fuller, deeper knowledge".[16] And again, "We should find that our differences often consist merely in our explanation of the truth, or the inferences which we draw from the facts of revelation, from the teaching of the church and from our own conceptions of the attributes of God".[17]

From the above it is clear that the conference was to be an effort on the part of the churches represented, to come to a better understanding of one another, each other's hopes and fears, strengths and weaknesses, in order that this deeper understanding might lead to an ever-increasing fellowship and, if possible, eventual reunion of all Christians into one visible body.

That this particular movement was greatly handicapped at the outset is evident. For one thing, the hopes of those who planned to make it a truly ecumenical conference were blasted by the refusal of the Roman

[15] *The Conference Spirit*, by a Layman, p. 10 (a pamphlet).
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Catholic church to send representatives, in its statement of refusal intimating that one way, and only one, was open to unite all Christians in one church, to wit, by joining the Roman church and submitting to the authority of the Pope at Rome, the one whom the Lord had designated to be head of the church. Besides, two important groups of Baptists, the English and the Southern Convention in the United States, refused to send representatives: the former because the proposed points of discussion had already received sufficient official consideration by them; the latter because it is not its policy to join in interdenominational movements.

The conference was held at Lausanne, Switzerland, August 3–21, 1927. "The churches that were officially represented in the conference were the Anglicans from thirteen countries; Baptists and Seventh-Day Baptists from four countries; Brethren from the United States; Christians from the United States; Congregationalists from five countries; Disciples of Christ from three countries; Eastern Orthodox from thirteen countries; Evangelical Churches of Germany, including seven provinces; Friends from two countries; Lutherans from fourteen countries; Mennonites from Germany; Methodists, including African, United, Primitive, Wesleyan, South, from twelve countries; Moravians from Germany; Old Catholics from two countries; Presbyterians, including United, United Free, Reformed, Evangelical of Bohemia, Waldensians, from twenty-two countries; and United Church of Canada, South India United Church, United Church of Northern India, Protestant Church of Portugal and Czechoslovak Church; in all making fifteen dis-

tinct church groups with five miscellaneous and one hundred and eight separate churches." [18] These were represented by some four hundred delegates.

The following subjects—I. The Call to Unity; II. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel; III. The Nature of the Church; IV. The Church's Common Confession of Faith; V. The Church's Ministry; VI. The Sacraments; VII. The Unity of Christendom and the Relation Thereto of Existing Churches—were each discussed in plenary session by two speakers,[19] then by the conference, and later by sub-divisions of the conference, whose task was to frame findings to be presented to the plenary session. Despite linguistic handicaps, racial cleavages, and traditional theological conceptions, the report on every topic save one—number VII—was so stated that it could be and was received by the full body without a dissenting vote. Tho the findings in no way committed the churches represented, the fact that they were received unanimously, of itself shows the deep underlying unity prevailing in the hearts and minds of those present.

The significance of the conference is variously estimated. There are its foes who neither before nor after it was held have been able to see in it any value. Of those attending, some felt it accomplished more, and others less, than they expected. The Bishop of Gloucester says, "that there is a fundamental unity among all the churches which were represented, from the Orthodox on one side to the Society of Friends on the other was

[18] *The Christian Union Quarterly*, July, 1928, pp. 92–93.
[19] Except I, which was introduced by only one address.

abundantly apparent." [20] Another affirms that in worship, prayer, work and study together "we learned to understand, to esteem, to love one another." [21]

Whatever may be said for or against it, the conference did accomplish one thing which had not been achieved since the Reformation—namely, it brought together for nearly three weeks of frank and fearless discussion the most representative group of Christians ever assembled. It was a splendid venture of faith, therefore, and if it helped to show the need for training for Christian unity, it was abundantly worth the effort. And who knows but the youth so largely absent in the conference in 1927, may be in a position to wield a telling influence for reunion when the next such conference is held?

Administrative and Federal Union

Two movements of recent years which have sought a closer co-operation in American Protestantism, but by different methods from any of those already named, are the Interchurch World Movement and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

I. The former was begun in 1918 by representatives of various missionary and benevolent boards, to be a temporary, non-administrative organization of the co-operating units. The Cleveland meeting of its General Committee of the Interchurch World Movement set

[20] Quoted by E. D. Soper in *Lausanne: The Will to Understand*, p. 80. For other authoritative material on the subject—*Lausanne, 1927*, Canon Edward S. Woods, and *The Christian Union Quarterly*, October, 1927.

[21] Herman F. Swartz, of Berkeley, California, in *Christian Union Quarterly*, October, 1927, p. 250.

forth its purpose and program essentially as follows: It is a co-operative effort of the missionary, educational, and other benevolent agencies of the evangelical churches of the United States and Canada, to survey their common tasks, working together to secure the necessary money and men for these tasks, in a spiritual way, without in any manner seeking either organic union, or the disturbance of the organized life of the churches, and expecting it to be of temporary duration. The Committee on Reorganization stated that the Movement had come into existence prompted chiefly by (a) a growing sense of kinship among the evangelical churches, (b) a keen realization that the churches were putting forth an inadequate effort to meet world needs laid upon them by the war, and (c) a belief that thru a large co-operative effort an enlistment of life and treasure could be secured—the better to meet these demands. The organization grew rapidly into favor, and for a year perfected plans which culminated in a simultaneous financial campaign in the spring of 1920, in which the thirty odd co-operating denominations sought to gather the fullest harvests from their respective fields, while the Movement itself should solicit the "friendly citizens" for its funds—to the extent of $40,000,000. The financial campaign of the denominations was largely successful; that of the "friendly citizens" was not—a fact which alone would have necessitated the end or radical transformation of the Movement.

However, other factors entered to hasten its early close. Not least among these was a growing fear on the part of a large number of people, that, because of its

aggressive policy, the Movement would become a super- rather than an inter-denominational agency. Its administrative powers soon loomed large, because every local church, as well as the state denominational agencies, were receiving instructions as to what to do, amounts of money to be raised, and what proportion of the total amount raised this or that co-operating unit would be allowed to use for itself. Other reasons for its abandonment were (a) lack of a well-thought-out plan, which caused some to view it as temporary, others as a permanent organization, while some hoped it might eventually be an agency for organic union; (b) the fact that it originated among officers of denominational boards rather than in the General Assemblies or Conventions of the denominations; (c) that it undertook to accomplish too much in a short time; (d) and the innate fear of any form of co-operative effort on the part of a large number of members of the various churches involved.

Whatever the causes for the early passing of this great administrative effort at interdenominational co-operation, no account of recent movements in this field can be adequate which fails to mention it. It embodied a fine Christian vision, thru it a great work was accomplished, and there is no doubt that could it have been carried on, it would have proved the most efficient agency in Christian co-operation yet devised. Thru the generosity of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in endowing the Institute of Social and Religious Research, some of its values have been conserved thru the various publications issued by that organization.

II. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ

in America came into existence in 1908, thru the ratification by the national assemblies of thirty denominations, of a plan of federation which had been devised previously by representatives of the various denominations in a meeting in Carnegie Hall in New York City in 1905.

According to its Constitution the object of the Federal Council is declared to be:

"1. To express the fellowship and Catholic unity of the Christian church.

"2. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.

"3. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.

"4. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social conditions of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.

"5. To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities."

The constitution of the Federal Council provides that it shall have "no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it, but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the churches, local councils, and individual Christians. It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship, or in any way to limit the

full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it."

Membership in the Federal Council amounts to four members from each adhering body and one for each 50,000 members or fraction thereof. There are about 400 representatives officially named by the various denominations.

The democracy of the Council is protected by the following: "Any action taken by the Federal Council shall be by the general vote of its members. But in case one-third of the members present and voting request it, the vote shall be by the bodies represented, the members of each body voting separately, and action shall require the vote not only of the majority of the members voting, but also of the bodies represented."

It functions chiefly thru the following Permanent Commissions:

1. Commission on Evangelism.
2. Commission on Church and Social Service.
3. Commission on Church and Country Life.
4. Commission on Christian Education.
5. Commission on Temperance.
6. Commission on International Justice and Good Will.
7. Commission on Interchurch Federation (State and Local).
8. Commission on Relations with France and Belgium.
9. Commission on Relations with Religious Bodies in Europe.
10. Commission on Church and Race Relations (Ad Interim).

These Commissions "cannot commit the Council to any policy or expense" until approved by the Executive Committee.[22]

Its guiding principles in the formation of local federations are set forth in the following:

1. "By a council or federation of churches is meant the churches themselves as churches, consulting and co-operating officially, thru accredited delegates, for all accepted common tasks."

2. "Churches co-operating cannot recognize in the organization, or in the combined membership of the Council, any superior ecclesiastical authority." The only force "is that force which comes from frequent discussion and consequent united opinion".

3. A Council of Churches is an organization of the local churches themselves. It tries to do for them what a Chamber of Commerce does for the business life.

4. If specific tasks call a local unit into existence, its work cannot be limited to those tasks. The Council must make real the united life of the church in so far as that can be done under our present denominational organization.

5. A local council is an autonomous body. "It has no external official relationship with other councils, local, state or national." [23]

From the above it is clearly seen that all necessary safeguards have been set up to protect the integrity of

[22] All of above facts concerning the Federal Council are from the *Church Year Book*, 1923, pp. 255–262, and *The Council's Annual Report* for 1925.

[23] All of above facts from *Christian Unity*, section by R. B. Guild, pp. 110–116.

each participating body. The Council came into being thru the expressed will of the churches, and is their servant, not their master. It speaks in a representative capacity for the evangelical churches of the United States, serves as a clearing house for a considerable number of denominational and interdenominational activities,[24] and thru its various Commissions and Committees seeks to perform tasks which all denominations want carried out, but which no one of them can do alone.

For example, thru years of effort, fifteen denominations have now established their own Commissions working for peace in co-operation with the Council.[25] It has held conferences in 150 industrial centers where the weight of Christian influence was needed in helping to solve problems of capital and labor, it has sought to deepen the evangelistic passion for social and personal righteousness, and largely thru its agency was brought about the "Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which met in Stockholm, Sweden, August 19–30, 1925, composed of 610 delegates from forty-four countries and thirty-one different communions, representing a total constituency of 345,000,000." [26]

Movements of an Undenominational Character

To the above-named forms of interdenominational union must be added a number of movements or organizations of an undenominational character in and

[24] *Twenty-eight Denominations United in Service*, p. 9 (pamphlet).
[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 5–12.
[26] A. J. Brown, *The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work*, p. 6 (a pamphlet).

thru which many different branches of the Protestant churches have co-operated. These have been very largely forerunners of the former, and in a very real sense have prepared the soil in which have been cultivated the spirit and desire for co-operation now manifesting themselves in efforts at organic union.

An attempt will be made to give the names of the large majority of these movements, but limitations of space prevent an extended reference to them, except those which are the most significant.

I. Of this class the Evangelical Alliance holds an important position. It arose as a result of the conviction that "there were much more extensive areas of co-operative activity than had yet been cultivated" along the line of foreign missionary work. In August, 1846, a gathering was called in London with 800 representatives from 50 different evangelical bodies of Europe and America. At this meeting an organization was perfected and the name, "Evangelical Alliance", was adopted. Very soon branches were established in France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Hungary, Greece, the United States and Canada, and in the Missionary Boards of Japan and India. The branch for the United States was not organized until 1867. Its object was to co-operate with the other branches, to strengthen Christian union and fellowship, to counteract infidelity and superstition, and to promote religious liberty thruout the world. One significant international conference of the Alliance was held in the United States in 1873, where its purpose was declared to be "to bring Europe and America together in Christ

for closer union and fellowship, for a united testimony against unbelief and false belief, for the propagation of peace and good will among nations of the earth, and for the encouragement of every good work of the Master." Two other important meetings of the American branch of the Alliance were held; one in Washington, D. C., 1887, with from 1200–1600 delegates in attendance, which had for its general theme "National Perils and Opportunities", and another in connection with the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, 1893. A part of the Alliance work in the United States has been to prevent use of public funds for sectarian purposes, a study of conditions to prevent overlapping of churches, and the conduct of surveys in New York state in 1890. The influence of the movement has declined in the past two decades, but it was a preparatory movement leading up to the formation of more modern organizations like the Federal Council, 1908, to which the spirit and work of the Alliance has largely passed.

II. The American Bible Society is another co-operative agency thru which various denominations are seeking "to secure the translation, publication, and circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment, in all languages in all lands." It has agencies in Turkey, Egypt, Argentina, Japan, China, Brazil, Mexico, Porto Rico, Siam, the Canal Zone, and the Philippines. It was organized in 1816, to unite over one hundred local Bible societies which had sprung up over the country between 1808–1815. Representatives of the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Friends, Reformed and

Presbyterian churches participated in its foundation. While the Baptists, as a denomination, withdrew from it in 1835–37, due to differences which arose over translating the word "baptize" as "immerse", many Baptists co-operate with it yet. The Presbyterian, Methodist (North and South), Reformed Church in America. Reformed Church in U. S., the Congregationalist, the Church of the Brethren and the Methodist Protestant denominations make the society an object of their benevolences now.

III. The American Tract Society, 1825, is another organization which has proved its usefulness for co-operative work by all the denominations in certain lines of activities. Its official statement of purpose is "to diffuse a knowledge of our Lord Jesus as redeemer of sinners, and to promote the interest of vital godliness, sound morality, and good citizenship by the distribution of Christian literature in many languages thruout the world."

IV. The American Systematic Beneficence Society, founded in 1857, under the leadership of Matthew W. Baldwin, had for its object "to do something to elevate the tone of Christian principles and actions thruout the whole country without regard to geographical or ecclesiastical differences." It hoped to accomplish this end largely thru emphasis on the responsibility of Christian stewardship—and to make it effective in all denominations. For this purpose it carried on a crusade by the appointment of Sheldon Jackson as field agent, commissioned to "present the cause of systematic beneficence by addresses and public assemblies, by holding conferences with pastors of churches and friends of

scriptural liberality, and by other proper additional methods as may be most favorable." Tho it has disappeared as a movement, it exerted a splendid influence here and especially in England, where it was said of it in the 1864–65 report, "Nor are we to limit the effect of this movement of God to pecuniary results. . . . Freedom of thought, freedom of worship, freedom of organization, and freedom of contribution, will yet restore the long-lost love and unity of the Redeemer's people." It is clear that the hope for unity of the Redeemer's people, expressed in this closing sentence, was a result of the co-operation of different denominations which, working together in a limited sphere, had experienced a vision of still greater unity.

V. The organizations of an undenominational character, which have revealed both the desire and readiness of Christian people for co-operative effort as much as any others, are the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. The first local association of the former on the American continent was formed in 1851, and so eagerly did people respond to the idea it incorporated, that within three years forty-one more were founded.[27] Its growth has been rapid; it has spread over the nation and the world, until at the present time, its membership embraces millions, and its property value in fifty-two countries totals $225,210,910, and in this country amounts to $185,033,300. During the year 1906 thirty-seven new buildings or additions to old ones were completed.[28]

[27] *New International Encyclopedia*, Vol. 23, p. 817.

[28] Report of Y. M. C. A. National Council published in *New York Times*, Jan. 8, 1926.

The first Y. W. C. A. organization in the United States was formed in New York City in 1858, and so eagerly have people responded to the idea it embodies, that in 1915 there were 988 local associations with a total membership of 357,459, and property owned by 144 associations was valued at $12,444,879.[29]

At times these organizations have become almost rivals of the Christian church. But an earnest effort has been made in recent years to bring them and the churches into a closer working fellowship. It has been well said that "second only in importance to the question of an active and extending fellowship among the various denominations is this question of the vigorous inner co-operation and hearty mutual friendliness of the denominations with such powerful extra-ecclesiastical bodies as the Young Men's Christian Association." [30] To bring about this closer fellowship between the Y. M. C. A. and the churches, twenty of the national evangelical church organizations have appointed Commissioners to confer at stated times with representatives of the Association. Eighteen of these denominational bodies also have appointed standing committees on co-operation with the Y. M. C. A.[31]

The significance of the above step in this connection is the influence which the co-operation of Christians thru the "Y" has upon the denominational bodies in question; bringing them together for common interests with the Y. M. C. A. will surely have some in-

[29] *New International Encyclopedia*, Vol. 23, pp. 822–823.

[30] "The Churches and the Y. M. C. A.", by Dr. A. K. de Blois, *Watchman-Examiner*, Dec. 16, 1926.

[31] *New York Times*, Jan. 8, 1926.

fluence in developing a greater understanding among themselves.

VI. The Anti-Saloon League of America is a very effective instance of the co-operative power of people of all faiths, as applied to social improvement. Organized in Ohio as a state body in 1893, it has grown until its board of officers embrace members from practically every religious denomination in the United States, and its influence is felt thruout the nation. By adhering strictly to its purpose "to federate the temperance forces of the United States in an organized opposition to the beverage liquor traffic", it has been successful in leading the country to establish national prohibition. While the eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution may be regarded as its crowning achievement, it still has a large work to do in uniting the temperance people of all denominations and furnishing them a united front in opposition to the prevalent illegal traffic in liquor and in efforts to support temperance laws of the state and nation.[32]

Closely akin to the Anti-Saloon League is the National Women's Christian Temperance Union. It, too, is a good example of co-operative effort of Christians of all faiths. Its purpose is declared to be "to organize for the protection of the home the abolition of the liquor traffic, and the triumph of Christ's Golden Rule in custom and in law." [33] The World's Women's Christian Union embraces the "national" units in over fifty countries. "These organizations are neither partisan nor

[32] *Church Year Book*, 1923, p. 369, and Vol. 1, *New International Encyclopedia*, p. 720.

[33] *Church Year Book*, 1923, pp. 371–372.

sectarian. Its motto: 'For God and Home and Every Land' suggests the scope of its work and the breadth of its patriotism."

VII. Still another organization of this group is the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States. It sprang from a movement initiated by the Methodist Episcopal church in 1888, which soon gained the support of the Presbyterians (all branches), the Baptists, the Reformed Church in America, and the Lutherans, and to-day there are sixteen additional denominations which work thru it. It was first organized under the title, "The American Sabbath Union", but this was changed in 1908 to its present name. Its object is declared to be "to defend and preserve the Lord's Day as a day of rest and worship, and to enunciate and urge one day of rest in seven for all the toiling masses. By safe and progressive methods it works for the enforcement of Sunday laws and the securing of other legislation in the interest of the laboring forces and of Christian citizenship." It is distinctly an interdenominational body, and is supported by the free-will offerings of churches, societies and individuals.[34]

VIII. Three organizations which have helped to bring about co-operation among the varying denominations in the sphere of religious education are the International Sunday School Lessons Committee, the International Sunday School Council of Religious Education and the International Sunday School Association. While these are all interlocking movements, the second named being the one in which the other two head up, still they have distinctive fields of work, and are listed here separately

[34] *Lord's Day Leader*, p. 2, Vol. IX, No. 5, Sept.–Oct., 1923.

because of that fact. The purpose of the first named is "to prepare lists of lessons for Sunday schools on the basis of the best established principles of religious pedagogy"; that of the second named is "the promotion of religious education in the local church schools and in the community thruout its territory"; [35] and that of the third named is (a) "to co-operate with all agencies and forces that have for their aim the development of the Sunday school life of the North American Continent", and (b) "to be a common rallying organization for the Sunday school workers of all evangelical denominations and thus to foster the unified spirit of the Kingdom of God." [36] The fact that one is studying in his Sunday school class from week to week the same lesson used by thousands of others in varying denominations is one of genuine unifying power. Tho each denomination may give its own peculiar bias of interpretation to the scripture passage under review, it still is something that all of them are reading at the same time the same Bible selection. Moreover, these organizations have advanced the spirit of fellowship thru the national and international conventions they have set up. These convention sessions will be of particular weight in creating a sense of oneness of all Christian people, because so many young people are generally in attendance.[36a]

IX. Revival campaigns, as they are often conducted to-day, have been another means by which the spirit of unity has been to some extent nurtured and expressed. Led by such men as Charles G. Finney and Dwight L.

[35] *Year Book of the Churches*, 1923, pp. 311–312.
[36] *Half a Century of Growth and Service* (booklet), p. 12.
[36a] See Addenda, p. 328, "The Missionary Education Movement."

Moody of the latter half of the nineteenth century, and by Wm. (Billy) A. Sunday and Gypsy Smith of recent decades, special revival efforts have called for a degree of co-operation scarcely prevalent at any other time. For instance, the writer, as chairman of the Delegation Committee for a revival campaign in Newark, N. J., Jan.–Feb., 1920, under the auspices of the City Federation of Churches, when Gypsy Smith preached, arranged one evening service almost entirely given over to the participating churches. Mr. Smith asked the denominational groups to stand, one after the other. When hundreds of Presbyterians, hundreds of Baptists, hundreds of Methodists, and Dutch Reformed and Episcopalians (tho this denomination was not officially participating in the campaign), stood, and while standing together sang, "Blest Be the Tie That Binds", there was a manifest sense of unity present which by some had never been so keenly felt before. The centering of mind, heart, and strength upon the one great objective—that of winning people to Christ—for which the church primarily exists, has caused people of varying denominational affiliations to lose thought of the differences which separate them, and to think, for a while at least, upon the deep abiding spirit and motive which are common to all.

In addition to these undenominational organizations which have been specifically named, and to any other movements toward co-operation given elsewhere in this book, there are at least thirty-five other distinct and unrelated organizations functioning in this country whose general character makes them avenues of service

by which varying denominations co-operate in a greater or lesser degree in the furtherance of activities that, growing out of the Christian spirit, advance the cause of Christian righteousness. They include such well-known movements as the Pocket Testament League, the Gideons, International Daily Vacation Bible School Association, Women's National Sabbath Alliance, Florence Crittenden Mission, Boy and Girl Scouts organizations, American Institute of Social Service, United Society of Christian Endeavor, Interdenominational Evangelistic Association, the American Red Cross, and others.[37] The thing common to all is that they live upon the co-operative spirit and life of the Christian people of the various churches. So numerous have they become, and so similar in aim and method, that one who gives to them even a superficial study is led to the conviction that they themselves are in need of consolidation, federation, or co-operation, almost as much as are the numerous denominations of American Protestantism.[38]

All the movements toward co-operation discussed thruout this chapter, however, easily separate under two main heads, which may be termed the Direct and Indirect Methods of approach. To the first of these classifications belong the efforts to unite the different branches of one family group and the proposals for corporate or organic union of the denominations of varying family groups. Under the second may be subsumed all the

[37] See *Church Year Book*, 1923, pp. 300–374.

[38] Except where otherwise stated, the facts and quotations of the above of this chapter are taken from *Christian Unity, Its Principles and Possibilities; Approaches toward Christian Unity*, by Walker and Smyth; *Year Book of the Churches*, 1923; and letters of correspondence.

others. If one grants that the future is likely to reveal an increasing tendency toward interdenominational co-operation, as now appears to be true, an important question is—which of these two general methods will prove more efficient? In the opinion of the author it will be the Indirect.

The Direct, or Organic, Method of approach encounters at the outset what have always thus far proved insurmountable obstacles in the fear of uniformity of orders and doctrines. To leave out of account the Roman Catholic church's refusal to participate in the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order (a refusal which may have caused regret but not surprise), we have remaining, denominational groups which cannot unite upon the basis of ministerial orders thus far proposed. The Baptists (Northern Convention) refused to hold out any hope of union on such grounds, and so informed the Episcopal church. The Congregational churches expressed themselves with equal vigor in their Annual Conference of 1923, when they passed a statement of their attitude toward Christian unity, in which occurs the following: "The Congregational churches believe and affirm that they are true churches of the Lord Jesus Christ with a valid, apostolic, prophetic and priestly ministry; and we cannot recognize in any organization a more valid ministry or a higher ecclesiastical authority than that which we possess as a branch of the holy catholic church. . . . We stand ready to meet any approach toward closer visible union with other branches of the Christian church upon a level plane of mutual good will and mutual recognition of preroga-

tive. . . . We cannot by the abandonment of our name, or the disregard of our historic symbols, effect immediate union with other branches of the church of Christ." [39] The Assembly of the Baptist Union of Great Britain expressed its position on the same point with no less frankness when it affirmed that "union of such a kind as the bishops have contemplated is not possible for us. . . . Further progress in the direction of Christian unity can be secured, we are convinced, only by unreserved mutual recognition." [40]

Hardly less difficulty is met in this type of union effort regarding the matter of doctrine. For one thing, creeds have to state essentials, and there is no agreement on what essentials are. Therefore, in order to allow for change and growth in religious truth, they have to be either so evasive and ambiguous in statement as to have little meaning, or take for granted that the words as used by one generation to connote very definite and concrete meanings, will have, in all probability, an entirely different connotation for subsequent generations. If it is true, that, as John Robinson said, "it is not possible that the full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once", then the dogmas and creeds of one generation or century will cease to control the people of another, and dogmas which lose their former essence, or their former interpretation, and become inapplicable or uninteresting to the generation in power, will cease to bind people with an effective bond.[41] Be-

[39] Fully reported in *The Christian Century*, Nov. 1, 1923.
[40] Fully reported in *The Baptist*, Aug. 14, 1926, p. 824.
[41] C. W. Eliot, *The Road to Unity*, p. 39.

sides, while unity in the past has been sought thru creeds, and at times has been successful, just as often creeds have operated for division. The greatest objection to an attempt at union on the basis of uniformity of doctrinal statement has to do with the authority which must accompany it, to get it enforced. There are too many Christians among a large number of the different Protestant denominations who feel about authoritative creeds as did Dr. Lyman Abbott about wearing a gown at the Sunday chapel service at Yale. When asked if he would wear a gown, he replied: "If it is authorized I won't, otherwise, I will." But once more, this means of approach toward unity, as offered thus far at any rate, seeks to build it upon that which is transitory rather than permanent. If there be a unifying bond among Christians, it will have to be found in Jesus Christ, and not in a creedal interpretation of Him, however brief or vague. "There is no great difference between the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Thirty-nine Articles . . . scarcely any difference whatever. They are one in this—they are both singularly unlovable, and singularly undesirable. I cannot imagine any human being ever being brought to the feet of Christ by perusing either the one or the other." [42]

Wherefore, if along this line we have to hope for the unity of Christendom, we had as well make the words of Bishop Phillips Brooks our own. "I do not see," wrote Brooks, "the slightest promise in the dimmest distance of what is called organic unity of Christendom

[42] Rev. Norman McLean, *Christian Unity and the Gospel*, p. 111.

on the basis of episcopacy or any other basis. I do not see the slightest chance of the entire harmonizing of Christian doctrine thruout the whole Christian world—that dream which men have ever dreamed since Christ ascended into heaven, that sight which no man's eye has ever seen in any age." [43]

But the Indirect Method of approach toward Christian unity holds greater promise. For one thing, it permits slowness of change. Truths held for generations cannot be lightly set aside. Time is required to adjust, adapt, and relate views and practices to each other, and equally needed to adapt those who hold them to one another. This is taken care of thru the slower processes involved in administrative, federal, and undenominational types of co-operation. Thru them little may be accomplished in a year, or a decade, but linked with all other streams of influence which are producing changes, they are sure to bring to pass the desired end. "Human beings differ in no respect more widely than in their endurance of monotony and repetition. Change, even if it be progress, is repulsive to many human beings, while to others, variety, and especially some forward movement is indispensable." [44] Furthermore, the Indirect approach has in its favor the fact that many subjects and practices dear to the heart of those holding them are not disturbed or even mentioned in co-operative work. While it may be, and more often than otherwise is, true, that these who thus co-operate come to hold similar views and enjoy similar practices, they do so because no conscious

[43] Quoted by Seth W. Gilkey in *A Plea for Greater Unity*, p. 97.
[44] C. W. Eliot, *The Road to Christian Unity*, p. 25.

hostility has been roused in their minds toward views held by the others, thru mention of them when unity of effort was begun. Gradual change fulfills, then, the law of suggestibility in that it helps to take "the recipient off guard by avoiding the direct issue at first until a substitute attitude can be prepared for its acceptance." [45]

But the greatest advantage which the indirect method holds for accomplishing Christian unity is that it centers on practical needs and necessities of immediate Christian service. The masses can be brought to appreciate these concrete necessities. It matters not what the attitude of the Christian leaders may be toward the subject of the reunion of Christendom, little can be accomplished until the large majority are prepared for it and are willing to unite because they understand what it is all about. But when people are brought to work together in practical service better acquaintanceship is established, deeper mutual regard is created, and a wider and better knowledge of the points of strength and weakness of the various denominational branches of Protestantism results. These, taken together, furnish a soil for intelligent unity, and no one should seek any other. For the thing desired is not to bring the whole Christian church into a uniformity of worship, but rather to get every individual and separate church to bring its riches into the common structure. Time, training, and service—elements of the Indirect method of approach toward union—will eventually bring that to pass.

[45] F. H. Allport, *Social Psychology*, p. 251.

CHAPTER XI

TRAINING FOR CO-OPERATION

Impossible to Check

Without doubt the trend toward interdenominational co-operation is on in earnest. Any serious study of its needs and progress leads to a hearty endorsement of the conclusion reached by the Committee on the War and Religious Outlook. Wrote this Committee: "The movement toward union is an irresistible movement. It may be delayed, it cannot be permanently checked." [1] Desire is too strong, hope is too unyielding, achievements down to the present too numerous and effective in behalf of union, to doubt but that the deep sectarian cleavages of the past will be increasingly bridged by a sane and growing co-operation in the future. That being true, it is no less true also that definite efforts to train people for co-operation will advance its progress greatly. To the training they have received, more, perhaps, than to any other single thing, belongs the credit for existing denominational lines of separation. And by this same factor reversed, as much or more than by any other single thing, will these lines of separation be broken down.

Unconscious Preparation

There are important spheres of activity, over and above anything thus far named, in which an uncon-

[1] *Christian Unity, Its Principles and Possibilities*, p. 327.

scious and unorganized preparation for co-operation is now taking place. For example, one of these is the field of college and university education. How this applies to state supported institutions is obvious. With a student body drawn from every denomination, associating in closest friendship and fellowship thru clubs, fraternities, games and class work during their years of intellectual growth, many of them carrying courses of instruction in departments of religion where the emphasis is to establish respect for religion apart from any specific denominationally organized form of expression, and where mention of them is made, if at all, in the spirit of greatest tolerance—how can it be questioned that these students care less for sectarian divisions at the completion than at the beginning of such training? The problem is not to keep them rigid Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., *ad infinitum;* it is to save them to the Christian cause under any denominational title.

In so far as it applies to the influence of friendly association in club activities and intellectual growth thru class work, the situation is not essentially different in denominational colleges. All of these are doing an interdenominational educational work, in that their student body comes from many different denominations. Furthermore, it is true that in these denominational schools one rarely hears emphasized the cause of the denomination to which the schools belong. Few people would say that this policy is wrong. Nevertheless, as a result, young men and women of one sect, attending school in a college of another, and left free

from sectarian bias during the years of enlarging intellectual growth, are being prepared for a tolerant attitude toward all denominations. Besides, these same students, coming into contact with members of denominations other than their own, have been afforded the opportunity to see that such people can be Christians—perhaps even better Christians than some members of their own. Now out from such experiences and observations the inevitable question will not down—if to be Christian is the principal thing, and persons of different denominations are as equally Christian, then why foster denominational divisions?

By Marriage

As a further contribution toward this change take the matter of marriages between members of different sects. At one time the question of denominational affiliation was of first importance to the contracting parties. The author, while a student, recalls hearing a prominent minister, using the text, "I have married a wife and therefore I cannot come", warn his college audience against a loss to the denomination thru such intermarriage. To-day a broader sympathy recognizes the danger to lie, not in loss of members to other sects, but in the failure to consider seriously identification with any denomination whatsoever.

Various Civic Organizations

Civic organizations, for example, Rotary and Kiwanis clubs, also play their part in direct, if unconscious, preparation for interdenominational co-operation. Com-

prised usually of the best people from all denominations, they engage in specific, practical undertakings for community good, tasks Christian in spirit, but utterly devoid of sectarian bias. The friendly co-operation demanded in such secular service in some degree carries over into the realm of the religious life, thus paving the way for open-minded effort toward interdenominational agreements.

Whatever the work in which members of different denominations unite, if it is Christian in character and demands the employment of the Christian outlook and spirit to accomplish its end, there we find a field thru which a silent preparation for union is taking place. The frequent combination of churches in union summer services is a case in point. A large number of people are learning thru these, as by no other means, of the striking similarity between the actual services of worship of churches of different denominations. The numerous instances of union Thanksgiving services are another illustration of the same thing. There are many cases of united effort in conducting Sunday school conferences and teacher-training courses. For example, fourteen Protestant churches of Fairmount, West Virginia, carried thru such a training program in 1925, to the reported helpfulness of every participating church. Community choirs are making their contribution to the same end. One such choir in Boston comprised four hundred voices and embraced members from the Roman Catholic and Jewish churches, as well as the Protestant communions. In some cities churches which hold their own morning worship are uniting for the evening service.

Here and there we find cases of union communion services. All such instances of united effort as are cited show that people of different churches are ready to work together, but the point of deepest interest lies here—these are a training ground for larger co-operation in the future.

Place of the Radio

One other factor worthy of mention in this connection, tho its full influence is as yet unmeasured, is the radio. In all sections of the country where broadcasting of church services takes place on an extensive scale, it contributes to the weakening of sectarian lines. The "unseen audience" is very large, and indiscriminate as to denominational affiliation. As these people from all churches listen in, they are finding out to an extent they never knew before, how very much alike are the songs, sermons and prayers of churches of all denominations. Two letters out of eleven thousand received by one church concerning just one of its broadcast services help to illustrate this.[2] Writes one person from "somewhere in Kentucky", "I am a Jew. My wife is a Methodist. We both listen in every Sunday night when there is no static. Not only do we listen in, but look forward to the time that you go on the air. It is sixteen miles to my Temple, and it is four miles to a Methodist church. I am a farmer and not a white collar, so you see we both compromise and listen to you. Yours for all believers in God." Another from Aurora, Illinois, writes: "Little Brown Church is attended every

[2] *The Community Churchman*, February, 1927.

night by five or more, at our house, by Catholic, Methodist and two of those Presbyterians guilty of Sunday night staying away from church to listen to you. We are dropping in our nickels in a dish and when we get a dollar we will send it in." While these letters are from the files of a church which is avowedly seeking to bring about a sense of unity among religious people, still they are typical of those received by the strictly denominational church which broadcasts. What the ultimate result of this will be toward union of Protestant forces it is impossible to foretell, but that it is serving as a fine means of training for co-operation is evident.

Necessity for Special Propaganda

But the future of the movement toward interdenominational union or co-operation, if it is to progress rapidly, cannot be left to such casual or indirect means of preparation. There will have to be carried on a vast amount of well-directed propaganda, calculated to educate the majority of the Protestant church members to welcome it. It has been well said: "By far the greatest obstacle to genuine Christian unity is the lack of will to such unity. When Christ said: 'Blessed are the peacemakers' did He not lay chief emphasis on the word 'makers' even more than on the word 'peace'? So with reference to the drawing together of the Christians who acknowledge the Lordship of Christ, I cannot but believe that the great thing needed is for more Christians, one by one, not only to recognize the obligation for achieving unity but also to accept responsibility, to take

initiative, and to put forth unwearying and undiscourageable efforts to achieve these ideals." [3] For after all is said, the vast majority of Protestant Christians are deeply in love with their particular churches because they carry the conviction that theirs is the best denomination in existence, and embodies that ideal of policy and practice nearest to the New Testament teaching. When, therefore, Dr. A. N. Fortune affirms "that the greatest barrier to Christian unity is the denominational spirit," [4] and Bishop Boyd Vincent declares "misunderstanding of differences" [5] to be one of the greatest barriers, both are undoubtedly correct.

To Overcome Past Training

However, this should be said—these "greatest barriers" are not innate deposits in the lives of those cherishing them, but very reasonable fruitage of the process of education in things Christian thru which they have passed. Instances of the extreme denominationalistic program of training which members of the various sects have experienced and still enjoy are very numerous. The Baptist denomination has surely been as diligent as any other in seeking to convince its membership and constituency that its harmony with the New Testament teaching excelled all others and consequently it was superior to them, but in all probability it has not been more diligent than the majority of the other branches of Protestantism. The author recalls hearing in child-

[3] John R. Mott, *The Christian Union Quarterly*, Jan., 1927, p. 230.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 240.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

hood sermons (they were really theological debates) by the respective pastors of neighboring Baptist and Presbyterian churches, in which each "laid down the straight stick by the crooked", so that all who saw and heard could have no further difficulty in being convinced as to which sect was absolutely "straight" and which "crooked". When there is added to the influence of such sermons that of Sunday school instruction, ultra-denominational tracts, weeklies, etc., which are regularly consumed by the members of the various churches—all presented from the strictly denominational bias, and, like the horse trader, all telling the truth, yet careful not to tell all the truth—tho we may regret that the "denominational spirit" is broad, and that there is an absence of the "will to unity", still the reason for such a state of affairs is seen to be clearly the result of training, and not due to any inborn inclination in that direction.

Nor does this system of training apply only to years that are past. It is one of the chief indoor sports of the denominations to-day. One bishop of the Episcopal church, who is working for the unity of Christendom, nevertheless offered a prize for the best paper from a member of the young people of his diocese on "Why I am an Episcopalian." While the *Witness*, an Episcopalian weekly published in Chicago, commenting on the offer humorously remarked: "Here is my essay—a gem for brevity and honesty—'Because papa and mama were' ",[6] still, there is a great deal of truth hidden

[6] Bishop Fiske of Central New York. Reported in *The Christian Century*, April 9, 1925.

beneath the humor. Because papa and mama were is an answer which can be safely given to explain the denominational affiliation of a majority of Protestants to-day. And when parents supply the further stimulating information that important men have changed from other denominations to theirs, on the basis of conviction—as for instance, Adoniram Judson, who left the Congregationalist for the Baptist denomination—all this, supplemented by a liberal supply of strictly denominational literature, serves to encase them within a Chinese wall of denominational pride.

To Offset Appeal of Sectarian Pride

To judge by the Baptist denomination (to which the writer belongs), this effort to establish and maintain a sectarian spirit is not limited to the training of youth, but is intended for all. For example, much of our home missions propaganda is apparently written from the point of view that the Baptist denomination is obligated to make Baptists of every one. Take the following statement concerning the religious situation within the area of the Roanoke Baptist Association of North Carolina.[7] "The Roanoke Association includes seven counties: Halifax, Nash, Edgecombe, Wilson, Martin, Pitt and Beaufort. Here are the conditions in three of them, Wilson County has a white population of 20,500, and there are seven Baptist churches in the county, three of them in Wilson town. This means only four Baptist churches in the county to meet the needs of over 12,000 rural inhabitants. Beaufort has a white population of

[7] The author was a member of this Association.

19,000, and six Baptist churches. Two of these churches are in Washington town, and that leaves only four churches to meet the needs of 14,000 people out in the county. Three of these four churches are so weak they made no report to the Association last year, and the fourth one reported only 38 members. They cannot possibly sustain themselves, much less meet the needs of the county, without the aid of State Missions. Pitt County, with a white population of 22,500 is supplied by five Baptist churches. But two of these are in the town of Greenville, one in Farmville, and one in Bethel. That leaves one country church, with a membership of 48 and once-a-month preaching, to care for the spiritual interests of about 13,000 people. The work of State Missions is not finished by any means in this part of the commonwealth." [8]

Surely not from the standpoint of that statement. But what are the assumptions which form its background? The writer has no means of knowing how its author arrives at his figures, but, calculated on the basis of the United States Religious Census for 1916,[9] it appears that this was done. The total of all members of the white Protestant churches was subtracted from the total white population, giving the number of unchurched people to be as stated. (To do this does not give his exact figures, but allowing for a ten-year increase in population would.) Then he says that the Baptists are responsible for all of these. There is no mention made

[8] Letter of the Moderator of the Roanoke Association, printed in the *Biblical Recorder*, Sept. 29, 1926.

[9] Part one.

of any other denominations at work in those counties, leaving the unsuspecting to infer there were none. But the census report shows that there were (in 1916, at any rate), Freewill Baptists, Methodist Episcopal South, Presbyterian church South, Disciples and Episcopalians in all these counties. Besides, three of those denominations—Freewill Baptists, Methodist Episcopal South and Disciples—were numerically much stronger, while the Presbyterians and Episcopalians were equal in numbers to the Baptists of the Southern Baptist Convention. Do these other Protestant bodies bear no responsibility in the work of Christianizing these counties, or are they to be ignored—not being Baptists? Since they have hitherto done so well, the chances are that they also feel obligated to help to win for Christ the 12,000 of Wilson, the 14,000 of Beaufort and the 13,000 of Pitt County, and, in the final count, it will be found that they have won their share.

But, as stated before, the Baptist leaders and periodicals are not regarded as sinners in this matter of extreme statements and assumptions touching the place and power of their denomination above those of other denominations; on the contrary, they are all pretty generally guilty of the same thing. The point is this—when denominations thus lay such emphasis upon their particular beliefs as right and others' as wrong (or at least less perfect), and, as a basis of appeal for mission funds, evidently assume that each denomination alone is obligated to win all the existing non-Christian people for Christ, then we have little difficulty in determining whence originate the "greatest obstacles" to union, or even co-operation. Moreover, such a general policy by

magnifying differences, leaves unmentioned points of similarity which, if magnified, might lead to inter-denominational co-operation.

Emphasis on Points of Likeness

That there are points of likeness can hardly be denied. Consider this definition of a church: "The individual church may be defined as that smaller company of regenerate persons who in any given community unite themselves voluntarily together in accordance with Christ's laws for the purpose of securing the complete establishment of His Kingdom in themselves and in the world." Or this: "A gospel church is an organized body of baptized believers, equal in rank and privileges, administering its affairs under the headship of Christ, united in the belief of what He has taught, covenanting to do what He has commanded, and co-operating with every like body in kingdom movements." Or once more, this: "A . . . church is a congregation of baptized believers assembling themselves together at stated times for worship and mutual edification, and who are united for the purpose of extending the gospel over the earth".

To the churches in how many different denominations would these definitions apply? Surely to those of the Christian, Disciple, Congregationalist and Baptist denominations from any point of view. From the standpoint of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Reformed denominations they would be good definitions too. Each of them lays claim to a baptized membership. One would insult *them* to say their members are not regenerated. They all are vociferous in affirming they

are established according to New Testament teaching and Christ's laws, and have Him as their one and only Head. Only when a member of one sect began to say how many of the modifying terms in these definitions applied to the churches of the denominations other than his own would disputings arise. Yet all these are from the pens of leading Baptists; the first by Dr. Augustus Strong, the second by Dr. George W. McDaniel, and the third by Dr. E. Y. Mullins.[10] Still another definition furnished by a leading Baptist runs as follows: "A Baptist church is a body of baptized believers organized for worship and fellowship." That has the virtue of being succinct as well as true, too. It might just as well, however, have substituted for the "Baptist", the word "Christian", or the word "Disciple", or the word "Methodist", or the word "Congregationalist". Yet the one who wrote it,[11] (or someone else in an editorial in his paper, with the sentiment of which he evidently concurs), in arguing against the position that denominational weeklies help to foster denominational loyalties, thereby perpetuating division in the church of God, declared: "In our opinion loyalty to one's own denomination is at the present time the highest loyalty to the Christ of our salvation." [12]

Inescapable Similarities

But points of similarity between churches are subtly revealed not only in definitions of what a local church is,

[10] As published in *The Word and Way*.
[11] Dr. Curtis Lee Laws.
[12] *Watchman-Examiner*, Sept. 24, 1925, p. 1230.

but also in the claims and arguments employed to encourage people in their denominational love and allegiance. For example, a Baptist State Secretary, in seeking to arouse the churches of his denomination to greater liberality, begins his appeal by citing the truly heroic efforts of the early denominational leaders in his state in overcoming many hardships, and calls attention to the sacrificial spirit they manifested and the deep faith they exhibited in planning for large accomplishments, when their numbers were few and their financial strength small. Then he writes: "Surely as we look back over the ninety-seven years since our fathers began this work we can say with old Samuel, 'Hitherto hath the Lord helped us.' " [13] There is no question as to the verity of this statement, as it applies to the missionary Baptists of North Carolina. Their history has been a splendid one. But neither is there any question but that the same can be truthfully declared of the Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, Disciples and Christian denominations, even down to the words of "old Samuel." However, we wonder, of the Baptists who read the article, how many felt that its statements were true of their denomination alone! In a very fine denominational address,[14] Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke declared the Baptists "occupy a position of strategic importance in relation to the life of Europe," that "their generations of experience and their strategic position have cast upon British Baptists an unescapable responsi-

[13] Article in *Charity and Children* of Sept. 30, 1926, by Dr. Charles R. Maddrey.

[14] Printed in *Watchman-Examiner*, May 27, 1926.

bility" to-day, and then goes on to affirm, "the maintenance of Baptist communities can be justified only by qualities of universal and abiding worth." Furthermore, he declared the unifying principle of Baptists he found "to be the Protestant motto, *sola fide*, 'by faith alone', the personal faith that involves direct immediate relation with God in Christ," and that this single principle had far-reaching implications in making for a church "built up of men and women believing and confessing," who "must reject all lordship that conflicts with the authority of the one Lord of the Soul." He implies that the essentials of a church are "not in organization," but a group of people who have an "experience of faith," which can be "a continuous creation," instilling a sense of social responsibility in its members and practicing a form of baptism that symbolizes regeneration and "expresses the believer's reverence for the sole authority of Christ." To be sure it is a great statement, in the original, beautifully phrased, and, no doubt, truly setting forth the denominational pride of the British Baptists. But is there a point in it which, from their own position, the Presbyterians, Methodists and Quakers of the British Isles would not claim for themselves? Is there a point in it which any Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Reformed, Disciple or Christian in the United States would not say applied to him (save, of course, its reference to responsibility in Europe)? Is there any teaching in it (except that bearing on immersion), claiming to be true of the Baptist, which even a Baptist would not say is true of the principal denominations of America? Counting,

then, its many descriptive terms which apply to Baptists, all but one are likewise true of the other leading Protestant denominations. Surely the points of similarity among American churches are just as numerous and important as are the points of difference! But how many of those reading the denominational literature furnished them by their respective churches have this aspect of the matter emphasized? If they were stressed would it not be true to fact? Would it not help also to create the "will to unity" and do away with some of the "misunderstandings of differences"?

Other similarities the late Professor Rauschenbusch has strikingly expressed as follows:[15] "The divergent types of church government which separated these bodies" (the Methodists, Baptist, Prebyterian, Disciples, Congregationalist, German and Dutch Reformed) "have been worn down by generations of practical experience, and they have gravitated toward the same general methods of work and life. The Presbyterian type has become more congregational, and the Congregational type has become more presbyterian and representative. The Methodist polity presents the most marked difference, but fortunately Methodists have not set up any claim to divine right and legal succession for their episcopate. It is based on efficiency and utility, and the other churches have no real quarrel with centralized power when put on that basis. In fact, they are developing it to meet their own needs. The most decisive fact for the essential unity of these great bodies is that they have all

[15] Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, *The True American Church* (a pamphlet).

thoroughly assimilated the principle of democracy and are allowing any *jure divino* theories to fall into oblivion.

"In their form of worship they have also converged. A Sunday morning service in a Presbyterian church differs in no essential from a service going on in a Methodist or Baptist church around the corner. There are important differences still about the sacraments, but they concern the form and not the substance. These denominations have all outgrown sacramentalism, and since the interest in the old questions is fading out, the next twenty years are almost certain to bring them still closer together.

"The religious thought and teaching heard in these churches belongs to the same type. Their ministers all draw their ideas and inspiration from a kind of common reservoir of religious thought. Whatever differences exist are due to the personality of the preachers more than to the denominational impress.

"These churches have all developed the same form of evangelistic appeal, the same type of religious experience, the same methods of teaching the young, the same organizations inside of the local church, the same social meetings for the culture of the spiritual life."

A concrete instance of the above is offered in the statement of a Christian minister, who, while obviously cloaked in the conviction that he was naming distinctive reasons for belonging to the Methodist church, in reality named reasons just as truly applicable to any one of the leading Protestant churches in America. "I belong to my church, recognizing that it does not include all of Christendom. I lament the divisions of the body of

Christ, but I am not able to heal them nor are they likely to be altogether healed in my day. I belong to my church because it represents one of the most significant religious movements of modern times. I belong to it because I believe that, as effectively as any other, it is now serving God and mankind. I belong to it because it seems to me better to co-operate with a large body of Christians than to fritter away my life in individual effort. I belong to it, not because it is the ideal or only church, but because I am familiar with its usages and can be of more service in its fellowship than in any other. I belong to it because I love that fellowship and find in it my spiritual home while I continue in this world." [16]

Thus far in this chapter an evaluation has been given of some important activities which, because they unite people in many useful tasks, are thereby preparatory training schools for church co-operation; also, arguments have been advanced to show that if the absence of the will to unity, the denominational spirit, and the misunderstanding of denominational difference, all named as the greatest obstacles in the way of co-operation, are to be overcome, an increasing emphasis must be placed upon the points of similarity obtained between the leading Protestant denominations, and less stress upon their points of difference. There remains one further matter to be considered.

Need for Religious Leaders of Wide Sympathies

In the past the cause of denominationalism has flourished because there were leaders trained for that

[16] From a letter published in *The Christian Century*, March 15, 1923.

objective, who, in turn, taught it to the people and led them in its establishment and maintenance. No more heroic story of loyalty and fidelity to the truth as they saw it can be found in the annals of American history than the one which tells us of the lives and achievements of the old-time denominational preachers. For depth of conviction, devotion to duty, purity of character, willingness to sacrifice, and readiness to suffer hardship as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, as they moved within the limited sphere of interests pertaining to their particular denominations, neither they nor their record can be excelled. Obviously what is needed to-day is a group of Christian leaders, especially ministers, who will embody and express before the people these same qualities of character and Christian service in behalf of the cause of interdenominational co-operation, if this cause is to prosper as it may and should. If there were an army of young ministers crusading to-day for a larger unity by laying hold of every available argument in its behalf, fearlessly and sacrificially teaching it to the people because they themselves had been so taught, more would be done to advance the cause of co-operation than thru any other single means. So an important question is this: To what extent are the present-day ministers being trained to lead in this work?

What Seminaries Are Doing

After an exhaustive study of the training the seminaries of the United States and Canada are furnishing to their students, Dr. Robert L. Kelly writes: "As a

group of schools they certainly are not contributing to unity, however much individual seminaries may hold to that ideal. There is great diversity in the seminary product. There is ground for fear that the influence of some of the seminaries goes deeper than this and tends toward divisiveness. Denominations, Occidental in origin, partly thru the influence of seminaries, are being perpetuated even in Oriental countries. As the seminaries are frequently the bulwarks of special doctrines, this is not surprising. The question is, shall we look to the seminaries for leadership in finding the answer to the Master's prayer that they all may be one? Or, shall we look elsewhere?" [17] Certainly this summary statement furnishes little encouragement. Nor is it contrary to the general tenor of other sources of information.

In a symposium on ministerial training furnished by the deans and presidents of six leading Baptist seminaries two name special training in Baptist principles and practices as essentials, and only one even names the task of training young ministers for co-operative work as one belonging to the seminary's curriculum—tho he stresses it as the chief task.[18] To be sure, it must not be inferred that the former two, in giving their own denomination's principles and practices as comprising a part of an adequate training for Baptist ministers, necessarily meant thereby to leave out of account a knowledge of the beliefs and polities of other denomina-

[17] Robert L. Kelly, LL. D., *Theological Education in America*, p. 233.

[18] "Adequate Theological Training—a Symposium." *The Baptist*, June 19, 1926.

tions; nor should it be assumed that those who failed to mention specifically training in interdenominational activities did not have it in mind. Obviously, to take such a position would be unfair to the writers. But this much can in justice be affirmed—that a training for interdenominational co-operation does not appear except to one of them of equal importance as the subjects specified, nor is such training likely to be a part of the curriculum of any seminary in question. This need not cause great surprise. Dr. Kelly says as a rule seminaries of necessity are bulwarks of special denominational doctrines and polities. This too is to be expected. They have been founded for the primary purpose of training men to be preachers of the denominations which founded them. Wherefore, despite the personal inclination or hopes of their professors in behalf of training for interdenominationalism, until a demand for such training arises, little can be done save for the seminaries to perform the work for which they were primarily established.

Granting the above to be true, there is one small window in the house Dr. Kelly has built, thru which one ray of hope appears. It is this—"individual seminaries may hold to that ideal", i. e. contributing to the cause of unity. Even as they are at present organized and conducted, there is much in the seminaries which tends to create a breadth of outlook and understanding entirely friendly to interdenominationalism. For one thing, in the leading theological schools emphasis upon differences decreases; emphasis upon likenesses increases. The attitude of a large number of theological

professors toward strict denominationalism has undergone a radical change in recent years. The following incident, related by Dr. Charles W. Eliot, is a good proof. "In the summer of 1918 one hundred and thirty persons, teachers in forty-nine Theological Schools scattered over the United States east of the Rocky Mountains, and belonging to fifteen different denominations, met by invitation at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to discuss problems of theological education arising out of the War. All the proceedings at this Conference were earnest, harmonious, and full of spiritual significance. On the morning of the last day seventy-seven of these teachers of theology attended a Communion Service conducted by a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the University Chapel which had never been consecrated. There were no deacons; and the two ministers who prepared the table were a Congregationalist and a Unitarian. Five men in a row were seen to receive the elements from the Bishop with the same devoutness. These men were the Dean of the Harvard Divinity School, a Unitarian, the President of the Western Theological Seminary of Pittsburgh, a Presbyterian, the President of the Garrett Biblical Institute, a Methodist, the President of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, an Episcopalian. That Conference and that Communion Service were milestones on the road toward Christian Unity." [1] Teachers of such breadth of sympathy and interests as this incident describes, will inevitably influence their theological students in behalf of a like wide outlook.

[1] *The Road to Unity among the Christian Churches*, pp. 62–63.

Breadth of sympathy and a spirit of tolerance, after all, combine to furnish the tree on which grows the fruit of unity.

Undenominational Seminaries

Besides, in the case of many of the leading seminaries one gets a training for co-operation in his association with ministerial students representing different denominations. Of this class of seminaries the Yale Divinity School is typical. Its student body (1926–7) comprised 63 Methodists (20 Northern and 43 Southern), 33 Disciples, 32 Baptists, 32 Congregationalists, 17 Presbyterians, 3 United Presbyterians, 9 Christians, 5 Lutherans, 5 Evangelicals, 4 Episcopalians. It is idle to say that such an association and atmosphere do not contribute toward a preparation for co-operation.[20] This comes to light in part in the interest which these students manifest in the cause of union on the program of their student conferences. It comes to light again in the opposition of some denominational leaders of the more conservative type. And again, its influence is revealed in the attitude which ministers so trained have toward the cause of union after they are out in their fields of labor.

A Questionnaire

But the best material which the writer has to offer on the present status of theological education in its bearing on both the points of what is being done and what needs to be done, is that collected by himself. A

[20] See *Theological Education in America*, pp. 216–217.

questionnaire was sent to the church history professors of all seminaries in the country. The head of the history department was chosen because of the conviction that the manner in which the historical development of the Christian churches was treated would have more to do in the formation of the student's attitude toward the problems of denominationalism than in the case of any other single subject. Manifestly this procedure has great drawbacks, due to its limitation to one subject, still the position taken is essentially sound.

The following is a condensed copy of the letter with the full questionnaire:

MY DEAR SIR:

In the preparation of my Th. D. thesis in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., on the subject—"The Need and Progress of Interdenominational Co-operation in American Protestantism", it has occurred to me that one helpful step toward a closer union and co-operation will be made thru a clear and sympathetic understanding of the history, doctrine and polity of the various denominations of the United States on the part of the students in our seminaries who are to be our clergymen and future denominational leaders. In order to get first hand information as to whether the Seminaries of the country are offering and giving courses calculated to accomplish this purpose, I am sending to the Church History Professors of all the Seminaries of the country, this questionnaire with the request that they be kind enough to answer it and return to me in the enclosed envelope.

If the questions as I have worded them do not cover all the facts relative to the work of your Seminary in this particular, and to you as the professor of Church History, please

add any further comments necessary to give a full, fair and just view of your work.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you offer a course in American Church History?
2. How comprehensive is it?
   a–How many denominations are studied?
   b–Relative amount of time given to each?
3. Is chief stress laid upon the denomination which your own Seminary represents?
4. What is the purpose of the course?
5. What do you teach with regard to the relation of your own church or denomination to other religious forces as a whole, and to other Christian bodies in particular?
6. What is your opinion of the present-day movement to have a closer denominational co-operation in our country?
   a–As it applies to the larger denominational organizations, such as State Associations, National Conventions, and General Assemblies and Conferences, etc.
   b–As it applies to the local churches of the smaller towns—from 500–3,000 population.
   c–As it applies to State, Home and Foreign Missionary Endeavor.

The table on the opposite page shows the number of seminaries from which replies were received and their respective denominations:

While the answers revealed a deep interest in the subject-matter and a most sincere effort to give a courteous and trustworthy representation of the real facts,

Name of Denomination [21]	*Number of Replies Received*
Baptist	8
Seventh-Day Baptist	1
Christian Reformed	1
Congregational	6
Disciple	2
Episcopal	9
Reformed Episcopal	1
Lutheran	9
Methodist	5
Presbyterian	13
Reformed Church in U. S.	1
Unitarian	2
United Brethren	1
Universalist	2
United Presbyterian	2
Undenominational	3
Total	66

as was natural to expect, not all are of equal value, nor so stated as to be easily summarized. For one thing, categorical answers were hard to make, so there appeared many qualifications and reservations, in some cases very copious, extending from one to two typewritten pages. Besides, some of the questions as worded were evidently clearer to the one who framed them than to those who tried to answer. Particularly was this true of number five. Several passed it by saying they did not know what it meant. Then, too, the questions themselves are of unequal rank in so far as their an-

[21] In the case of the Baptist and Presbyterian seminaries, six of the former were Northern and two Southern, eight of the latter were Northern and five Southern.

swers would apply to the problem of co-operation. Clearly those of greatest importance are number one, three, four and six. All of these considerations have entered into the making of the general summary given here. When that is done, however, we still have much material which is valuable because of the light it throws upon the nature of the training given in the Church History departments of these seminaries, which may influence the theological students for or against interdenominational co-operation.

For example, query number one showed that of the sixty-two seminaries reporting, thirty-nine only gave courses in American Church History, leaving twenty-three either lacking in such a course entirely or bringing it in for a brief reference in connection with the course in General Church History. Of those offering an American Church History course, only twenty-eight gave as much time to it as two hours per week for three months. One reply brought the information that the seminary it represented had no course in church history of any sort, tho it entertained the hope of establishing one in a year or two.

Question number three disclosed the following situation. Of the sixty seminaries which treated American Church History either in a special course or as a part of a course in General Church History, forty-one laid chief stress upon the history of the denomination to which the seminary in question belonged, leaving nineteen in which it was said that all the various Protestant divisions were treated equally—both as to time and method employed.

Query number four was intended by its framer to elicit information as to whether the class study was conducted with a view to establishing a restricted denominational spirit, or a breadth of view calculated to create a friendly sympathy for all the chief branches of the Protestant church. Not all the answers given fall within these classifications. However, fifty-two were capable of being so designated; of these, twenty-two belong to the former, and thirty to the latter group. While the whole number in the first-named class belongs to the list of forty-one under question three, a number of these tho giving chief interest to the history of their particular sect, taught that it was a part only of the stream of Christian history, the outside sects not suffering in the comparison made.

Fifty-four replies to number five showed forty of them to come from teachers who sought to create (in varying degrees, however,) a sense of the need for friendly co-operation among the Protestant denominations. Only fourteen were holding the position of strict aloofness.

Question number six, held by the framer to be the most important of all in the possible contribution its answers would make to the purpose of the questionnaire, was proven to be such in the final count. Sixty-three answered it, forty-nine of whom revealed a strong personal friendliness for, and belief in, the cause of co-operation in every way in which it could be fairly and legitimately brought to pass. Only fourteen were personally opposed to anything belonging to the union-of-Protestantism idea. One professor in a leading seminary

of one of the prominent northern denominations—a denomination which as much or more than any other leads in the work of interdenominational activities—colorfully replied to the whole of number six with the heated word "damnable".

Replies of Note

In a few instances the answers of professors in principal seminaries of important denominations deserve a fuller treatment here, because of their earnest effort to furnish a comprehensive view of the position they hold. For example, a professor in an important Baptist seminary, in stating reasons for his own and his denomination's comparative aloofness from co-operative movements, affirmed the following: "In general, if present movements for closer co-operation could be emptied of the organized 'union' notion now in the backs of so many Federations heads, Baptists could join most heartily in such work. But that notion is fraught with many dire dangers not only to Baptist integrity, but to spiritual religion". In giving reasons for his personal friendliness toward the co-operative cause, and for his belief that the Baptist denomination should take part in it, another professor in another important Baptist seminary writes thus: "I think that it is going to be necessary for all the evangelical bodies to reconsider their positions and especially the reasons why they are occupying them to-day. I think that inadequate reasons for denominational positions are more detrimental to the Christian cause than the divisions themselves; they are keeping the church divided which should come

together. We Baptists have as much to do in this direction as any, but I think we are doing more thinking and discussing of this question in relation to our own denominational life than any other denomination is doing. My opinions regarding the application of co-operation are practically the same for 'a, b, and c'. Almost every effort should be encouraged, but positive reconstruction should follow evidence of support by the moral and religious spirit of those involved. Patience must have its perfect work, and funerals do much especially in local communities."

All Congregational professors are strongly in favor of increasing co-operation. The reasons given may be illustrated by the following replies. "Because of the alarming decline in the marriage rate and the birth rate of Protestants in the United States, we shall be compelled to exercise the conservation and the correlation of our religious forces—if we are to meet successfully the increasing competition of Romanism and Judaism. The former is now in the majority in each of the New England states—the old home of the Pilgrim Fathers. In greater New York City, there are now more than one million Jews." Or this: "The need (for co-operation) is especially seen in all missionary activities at home and abroad. Co-operation has proceeded much faster abroad than at home. There must be closer co-operation and the spirit of give and take in church planting in mission fields at home; in cities and in towns and in the open country, to prevent over-lapping and to conserve home missionary men and money, and also to build up stronger and more effective agencies. This can only be

brought about by the most generous co-operation of denominational agencies higher up."

The Lutheran professors are nearly all on the other side of the question, or in the middle-of-the-road position, to say the least. The following answers are typical in setting forth their attitude. "We are willing to go into Conference with other denominations or federations for discussion and even for co-operation which does not involve any compromise of our distinctive doctrines. We are against the multiplying of congregations in overchurched communities, but we do not believe in minimizing the importance of fundamental Lutheran principles for the sake of union. There is a measure of co-operation in the general work of missions (the boards confer and discuss matters and try to be helpful in interchange of ideas, etc.); but there is no thought of organic union, or any hope of a near prospect of it." Or this Lutheran statement: "The basic principle of the Lutheran church so far as the question of union is concerned is found in the words of the Augsburg Confession: 'And to the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, and ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike.' "

A Methodist professor, who represents the position of the larger number from this denomination answering the questionnaire, stated his favorable attitude in the following words: "I greatly favor the co-operation of all denominations. I favor the surrender of the field, when there is manifest crowding, to the one denomination

prepared to care for the field in the best way, in the home field as well as the foreign. I do not favor the federated church, as that is a surrender of all churches, and the securing of none in return. In other words, the federated church is like Melchisedec, 'without father, without mother, and without descent.'" Typical of the more conservative of this denomination, another professor guardedly replied like this: "When practical needs make necessary a union of some kind, there ought to be such an union, provided many important things, like loyalty to Christ, His truth, etc., are subserved and guaranteed."

Professors in important Presbyterian seminaries state their positions on either side of the matter as follows. "The movement should be favored up to the point of surrendering valuable principles. To preserve these, denominational lines will have to be preserved intact so far as respects the great denominations." But this is more favorable: "I think that it would be a splendid thing if the denominations could co-operate more fully in their Christian work. I think it would be well for our Church denominational organizations to consider more fully such co-operation. . . . There is great waste in ministers and in money in overchurched communities, even in the Home Mission sections of our country. I do not know just how we are going to justify ourselves before the Lord for such wastage of men and money. It is not probable and perhaps not desirable, that the great religious denominations will ever come together in anything like organic union, but it is highly desirable for them to come into closer comity and more hearty co-operation in all their Christian work."

One further generalization from these answers, which applies to a specific denomination, is this. The impression gained from the professors in the Episcopal seminaries is that their theological students are not being taught the desirability of interdenominational co-operation except upon a basis of unity of belief, and that as chiefly supplied by the Episcopal Church itself. For example, the following statement of purpose is typical of them all, both with reference to Church History in general, and American Church History in particular. It is "to show the place of English Catholicity in the history of the United States;" or again, as one other writes, it is "to train strong, efficient and intelligent clergymen of the Episcopal Church, whose position is justified by over eighteen centuries of church history; by the early Fathers, and the New Testament". While another professor of this denomination gave his answer to the questions in the same general tone and spirit, he did write under the head "remarks", "I don't know when I have had such an unpleasant experience as in answering your questionnaire. This is because the answers I have been compelled in truth to put down, must give a very sorry idea of our general temper and attitude toward Christian co-operation. There is nothing which I personally desire more to advance and further. I am eager for the Episcopal Church to make large sacrifices in its behalf. But you will pardon me if I say that the nature of your questions brings up many ancient theological and ecclesiastical controversies, which, to my mind, might well be ignored and forgotten. I add this, not in controversy at all, but just that you may not

judge me the bigoted fool, which the answers alone must unquestionably portray."

Leaders in Training for Co-operation

The above summary sufficiently sets forth the general temper, spirit and method of teaching Church History in the seminaries represented. From it this final summing-up can be made. In a majority of cases the instruction is given with a view to developing a broad outlook, which will embrace a sympathetic and tolerant attitude toward all denominations. Due to the fact that these professors are all working for denominational institutions, of necessity greater time and effort are put forth to impart a knowledge of the underlying principles and practices of the particular sect of which the seminary in question is a representative; still, this is done not in a bigoted spirit of denominational superiority at all, but in a way to prepare for the movement toward a closer co-operation which all the professors see to be one of the leading and important movements in American Church life. Certainly the results of the questionnaire will go to prove that the personal influence of three-fourths of the professors upon their students will tend to make them favorably inclined toward co-operation. The denominations, however, are not equal in this regard. Estimated upon the basis of the questionnaire the Congregationalist stands first, the Presbyterian next, the Baptist next, the Methodist next, while the Disciples, Reformed, Christian, and Universalist denominations come equally next. Both the Lutherans and the Episcopalians are seeking to a greater extent

than any of the others to build for a strictly denominational ministry. The latter, while doing much to advance the cause of union thru its advocacy and leadership in the Conference on Faith and Order, appears to be entertaining the hope that out from this and similar conferences there will come the conviction that its position alone is right, and therefore will be made to prevail. At least the training of their ministry points in that direction.

The Need for Such Training

In regard to what needs to be done in the field of theological education touching the training of ministers, in order that it may make a greater contribution to the cause of co-operation, one fact overshadows all others. A greater provision should be made for the study of this particular problem by establishing courses of instruction in it. Of the sixty-six seminaries represented in the questionnaire, only one had such a course, so named, with its purpose stated—to lead to a conviction that union, or co-operation, be a chief objective of the Christian ministry. That was an undenominational seminary located on the Pacific coast. One wonders if that seminary has anything to do with the more advanced progress of the cause of union in that section over other parts of the country; or has the progress of co-operation there caused the rise of the seminary, and its consequent emphasis on the movement toward union. Perhaps both. At any rate, the will to unity among the denominations of American Protestantism needs a ministry trained more with that end in view than is true at the

present time. In the meanwhile, one's hope will have to be linked with those denominational seminaries which manifestly hold a position friendly to the cause, and with those seminaries which are undenominational, whose student body is drawn from all the varying Protestant churches. For not until ministers are so trained will they to any great extent be ready to teach the people and lead them into Interdenominational Co-operation.

A Prayer

O Lord Jesus Christ, preserve Thy flock which Thou hast purchased with Thy right hand and redeemed with Thy Blood; even the whole Catholic church from the one end of the earth to the other. Unite all her members with the bands of faith, hope and love, and, when it shall seem good in Thine eyes, in an external communion. Let the daily sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving never cease, but be forever presented to Thee, and, united with Thy prevailing intercession, obtain for its members the blessing of peace and true concord; for Thy Name's sake, Who livest and reignest with the Father in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.[22]

[22] *A Manual of Prayer of Unity*, p. 10.

APPENDIX A

This appendix is a chronological arrangement of the white Protestant denominations in two main divisions—those "imported"; and those that arose in this country. In so far as the writer has been able to gather the facts, there is given for each denomination the date and place of its first establishment in some organized form; while in the case of "imported" denominations the names of the countries from which they came are supplied under the caption "Source".

DENOMINATIONS BROUGHT HERE

EPISCOPAL, officially named PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.
1607 on, at Jamestown, Va.; 1688, King's Chapel, Boston; 1698, Newport, Rhode Island; 1698, New York City; before 1700, in Maryland. First bishops were William Shite of Pennsylvania, 1787; Samuel Provoost of New York, 1787; and Samuel Seabury of Connecticut.
Source: England.

CONGREGATIONAL DENOMINATION.
1620 on, at Plymouth, Massachusetts. By 1640, of the 41 churches in New England, 39 were Congregational.
Leaders: Brewster, Bradford, and Winslow.
Source: England via Holland.

DUTCH REFORMED—Since 1867 entitled THE REFORMED CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA.
The Dutch landed 1623; first church organized 1628 at

Manhattan or New Amsterdam, N. Y. The first Coetus organized 1747; a Conferentie formed in 1755; the present form of organization perfected 1792.
Source: Holland.

LUTHERANS.
1623, at Manhattan and Albany. Source: Holland.
1638, on the Delaware River. Source: Sweden.
1639, the Fort Christina Church formed. 1646, the Tinicum Church, Pennsylvania, organized. From 1710, found in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Georgia.
Source: The Palatinate Exiles.

BAPTISTS (PARTICULAR).
1639 on, Providence, Rhode Island; 1644 on, Newport, Rhode Island. Leaders: Roger Williams and John Clarke.

BAPTISTS (GENERAL).
1650 on, Rhode Island. Leaders: Wickenden, Dexter and Brown.
1714 on, Burleigh, Virginia. Leader: Robert Nordin.
1727 on, Perquinnuss, North Carolina. Leader: Paul Palmer.
Source: British Isles.

These Baptist groups are placed by some among the denominations which arose in this country. However, since they were organized among the comers to this country, and especially, were led by ministers trained elsewhere, they are placed with the "imported" list here. Both the Southern and Northern Baptists naturally trace their history back to include these groups.

QUAKERS OR FRIENDS.

1660 on, Scituate, Massachusetts; 1656–1672, in Virginia; 1658–1672, in Maryland; 1670, in New Jersey; 1661, in Rhode Island; 1681–1682, in Pennsylvania. Sandwich yearly meetings were held as early as 1660. A meetinghouse at Shrewsbury, N. J., in 1670.

Source: England.

PRESBYTERIANS.

1640, Long Island; 1642, Hempstead; 1643, Manhattan; 1667, First Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J.; 1703 in Maryland; first Presbytery organized at Philadelphia, 1705.

Source: British Isles.

MENNONITES.

1650 on, New York and New Jersey; 1638 on, Germantown, Pennsylvania.

Source: Holland, Germany and Switzerland.

AMISH MENNONITE.

1698 on, in Pennsylvania.

Source: Germany, Switzerland, Holland.

GERMAN REFORMED now THE REFORMED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.

1709, in New York; 1710–1711, North Carolina and Virginia; 1719, at Germantown, Pennsylvania.

Source: Germany and the Palatinate, chiefly.

GERMAN BAPTIST BRETHREN (DUNKARDS).

1719–1723, at Germantown, Pennsylvania.

Source: Schwazenau, Germany. Westfriesland.

SCHWENKFELDER.

1734, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Source: Germany.

Moravian (Unitas Fratrum).
1735, in Georgia; 1740, came to Pennsylvania from Georgia.
Source: Bohemia and Herrnhut.

Brethren in Christ (River).
1752, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.
Source: Basel Canton, Switzerland.

Universalist.
1779, first church at Gloucester, Massachusetts.
Source: England.

The Reformed Presbyterian.
1774, chiefly in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.
Source: Scotland.

United Society of Believers (Shakers).
1774–1776, at Watervliet, New York.
Source: England.

General Convention of the New Jerusalem in U. S. A.
1792, first church at Baltimore, Maryland.
Source: England.

German Evangelical Synod of North America.
1840, Synod organized at Gravois Settlement, Missouri.
Title now used was the result of union in 1872, of
(1) United Evangelical Synod of North America.
(2) German Evangelical Society of Ohio, 1850.
(3) Evangelical Society of East, 1860.
Source: Prussia.

Amana Society or The Community of True Inspiration.
1843, near Buffalo, New York. 1885, moved to Iowa County, Iowa.
Source: Germany.

PRIMITIVE METHODIST CHURCH IN U. S. A.
1844.
Source: England, via Canada.

BUFFALO SYNOD (LUTHERAN).
1845, at Buffalo, New York.
Source: Erfurt, Germany.

CHRISTIAN REFORMED.
1845–1847, in Michigan.
Source: Holland.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN I.
1850 on.
Source: British Isles, via Canada.

CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH.
Before 1850, at Potsdam, New York; 1851, in New York City.
Source: Scotland and London.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN II.
c. 1855, United States.
Source: British Isles.

FRIENDS OF THE TEMPLE.
c. 1855, United States.
Source: Württemberg, Germany.

NEW APOSTOLIC CHURCH.
Following 1862; place unknown.
Source: Germany.

EVANGELICAL UNION OF BOHEMIAN AND MORAVIAN BRETHREN.
1864, at Wesley, Texas.
Source: Bohemia and Moravia.

Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
1872, at Neewah, Wisconsin.
Source: Denmark.

Mennonite Brethren Church of North America.
1873–1876, in Kansas, Nebraska and Minnesota.
Source: Russia, Crimea, etc.

The Hutterian Brethren Mennonite Church.
1874 on, in South Dakota.
Source: Hungary, via Rumania and Russia.

Conference of Defenseless Mennonites of North America formerly Nebraska and Minnesota Conference of Mennonites.
1873–1874, to Nebraska and Minnesota.
Source: Russian immigrants.

Salvation Army.
1881 on, in larger cities.
Source: England.

Evangelical Lutheran Jehovah Conference.
1893, at Greenfield, Michigan.
Source: Hesse-Cassel, Germany.

Norwegian-Danish Free Church.
1910, in Chicago, Illinois.
Source: Norwegian and Danish immigrants.

Evangelical Protestant Church of North America.
1911, in Cincinnati, Ohio.
The organization formed thru the union of the following divisions:
(1) The German Evangelical Protestant Ministers' Association, 1885, in the Ministerium of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Illinois.

(2) The German Evangelical Protestant Ministers' Conference, 1895, in Cincinnati, Ill.

Source: Germany.

Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.

June, 1917, at St. Paul, Minnesota.

The result of a union movement from the following divisions:

(1) Hauge's Synod, 1845.

(2) The Synod of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, 1856.

(3) The United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, 1890, from:

(a) The Augustana Synod, 1860.

(b) The Norwegian-Danish Conference, 1870.

(c) The Norwegian Anti-Missouri Brotherhood, 1887.

Source: Norwegian immigrants.

Kleine Gemeinde Mennonites.

1916, in Kansas.

Source: Russian immigrants, via Canada.

Regular Baptist.

Represent the original Baptists, before the distinction between the Calvinists and the Freewill. Carry their origin to the coming of the English Baptists.

DENOMINATIONS THAT AROSE IN THIS COUNTRY

Six-Principle (General) Baptist.

1652 on, at Providence, Rhode Island.

Leaders: Wickenden, Dexter and Brown.

Arose from a division in the First Baptist Church.

SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST.
1671, first church organized at Newport, Rhode Island.
Leaders: Stephen Munford, who came from England, and with Hubbard and Hiscox led in a division from the First Church.

GERMAN SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST.
1728, at Conestoga, Pennsylvania.
Leader: John Conrad Beissel.
The earliest break from the Dunkards.

SEPARATE BAPTIST.
1750 on, in New England.
Outstanding Leader: Isaac Backus.
Sprang from both Baptist and Congregationalist denominations.
1754, in Sandy Creek, Randolph County, North Carolina.
Leader: Shuball Stearns.

FREEWILL BAPTIST.
1752 on, in the Southern Colonies.
Leader: Elder Paul Palmer, of Pennsylvania.

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF N. A. (PRESBYTERIAN).
1754, United States.
Leaders: Two missionaries from Scotland.

METHODIST (METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH).
1766–1767, New York City.
Leaders: Philip Embry, Barbara Heck.
1764, Sam Creek, Maryland.
Leader: Robert Strawbridge.

UNITED BAPTIST.
1775–1800, in Virginia and Kentucky.
Resulted from the union of the Separate and Regular Baptists.

FREE BAPTIST.
1780, first church New Durham, New Hampshire.
Noted leader: Benjamin Randall.

UNITARIAN.
1785, King's Chapel, Boston, Massachusetts.
Noted leader: James Freeman.
1819, Baltimore, Maryland.
Noted leader: W. E. Channing.

CHRISTIANS CHURCH (AMERICAN CHRISTIAN CONVENTION).
1792–1793 on, Virginia; 1800 on, Vermont; 1803 on, Kentucky and Ohio.
Leaders: James O'Kelly, Abner Jones, and B. W. Stone, respectively.

UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST.
1800 on, in Pennsylvania.
Leaders: Wm. Otterbein and Martin Boehm.

EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION.
1803 on, Assembly among the Germans in Pennsylvania.
Leader: Jacob Albright.

BAPTIST CHURCHES OF CHRIST (DUCK RIVER).
1806–1808 on, in Tennessee.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN.
1810, in Kentucky.
Leaders: Revs. Finis Ewing, Samuel King, Samuel McAdow.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.
1810 on, first church Burch Run Church in Washington County, Pennsylvania.
Leaders: Thomas and Alexander Campbell.

Reformed Mennonite Church.
1812, in Pennsylvania.
Leaders: Francis and John Herr.

Evangelical Lutheran (Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States).
1818, at Somerset, Ohio.
Leaders: Missionaries sent out by Pennsylvania Ministerium.

Two-Seed in the Spirit Predestinarian Baptist.
c. 1820–1825, in Kentucky and Tennessee.
Leader: Daniel Parker.

Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church.
1821–1822, in North and South Carolina.
The division of the Associate Reformed Presbytery 1782, and Synod 1804, still persisting.

Friends (Hicksite).
1827–1828, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Leader: Elias Hicks.

Primitive Baptist.
1826–1835, in North Carolina, New York, Pennsylvania and Georgia.

Church of God in N. A. (Winebrennerians).
1828–1831, in Pennsylvania and Maryland.
Leader: John Winebrenner.

Methodist Protestant Church.
1830, Baltimore, Maryland.
Leaders: Ministers who revolted against the rule of Bishops.

General Synod of Reformed Presbyterian Church in America.
1833–1837, thruout the country.

STAUFFER MENNONITE.
1840–1850, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania.
Leader: Jacob Stauffer.

YORKER OR OLD ORDER BRETHREN.
1843, York County, Pennsylvania.

WESLEYAN METHODIST.
1843, in Utica, New York.
Leaders: Orange Scott, Jotham Horton, LeRoy Sunderland.

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS (MORMONS).
1844, in Utah, at Salt Lake City.
Leader: Brigham Young.

CHURCHES OF CHRIST.
1840–1850, thruout the country, but especially in Virginia and Kentucky.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH (SOUTH).
1845, in Louisville, Kentucky.
Leaders: Bishop Soule and Bishop Andrews.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST.
1845 on, at Washington, New Hampshire.
Leaders: Joseph Bates, James White, Mrs. Ellen G. White.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST (S. B. C.).
1845, at Augusta, Georgia.
Organized by 300 delegates from the Baptist churches of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Kentucky.

FRIENDS (WILBURITES).
1845, 1854, 1877–79, 1905, in New England, Ohio, Iowa, Kansas and North Carolina respectively.
Leaders: John Wilbur and Joseph Gurney.

EILSEN'S SYNOD OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.
1846 on, United States.
Leader: Ellen Eilsen.

CHURCH OF GOD (NEW DUNKARDS).
1848, in Indiana.
Leaders: George Patton, Peter Eyman and others who withdrew from the German Baptist Brethren.

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF MENNONITES OF NORTH AMERICA.
1847–1848, in Pennsylvania.
Leader: John Oberholzer.

CHRISTADELPHIAN.
Following 1848, in United States and Canada.
Leader: John Thomas, M. D.

FREEWILL BAPTIST (BULLOCKITE).
Following 1835 (1850 perhaps), in Maine.
Leader: Jeremiah Bullock.
Division from the Freewill Baptists, led by John Buzzell, Charles Bean and Jeremiah Bullock. Divided again under leadership of two latter.

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIAN CHURCH (FAITH ASSOCIATION GROUP).
c. 1850 on.
Leader: Rev. S. H. Froelick.

CONGREGATIONAL METHODIST.
1852, at Forsyth, Georgia.
Leaders: Rev. Hiram Phinazee and Mr. William Fambro.

Reformed Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
1852–1853, at Lamoni, Iowa.
Leader: Joseph Smith, Jr.

United Zion Children (River Brethren).
1853, in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.
Leader: Matthias Brinser.

Evangelical Synod of Iowa, and Other States.
1854, in Iowa.
Leaders: G. Grossman, J. Deindorfer.

Adventist Christian Church.
1855, in New England, chiefly in Massachusetts.
Leader: Jonathan Cummings.

United Presbyterian Church of North America.
1858, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The Church of God in Christ (Mennonite).
1859, in Ohio.
Leader: John Haldeman.

Free Methodist Church.
1860, at Pekin, New York.
Leaders: B. T. Roberts, Wm. Cooley, and their sympathizers.

Defenseless Mennonite.
1860.
Leader: Henry Egli.
Conservatives from the Amish Mennonite church.

Christian Union.
1863–1864, at Columbus, Ohio, and Terre Haute, Indiana.
Leaders: Rev. J. F. Givin, J. F. V. Fleck, and Ira Morris.

Presbyterian Church in the United States (South).
1864, in southern states.
Formed thru the union of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America (old school) and the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church (new school).

Life and Advent Union.
1864, in Wilbraham, Massachusetts.
Leader: J. P. Walsh.

Church of God, Adventist (Unattached).
1864–1865, in Michigan.
Leader: Elder Cranmer.

Amish Mennonite (Old Order).
1865, in Illinois.
Most conservative of all Mennonite groups.

Social Brethren Church.
1867, Arkansas and Illinois.

Non-Sectarian Church of Bible Faith.
1868 and after, chiefly in Wisconsin.
Leader: Rev. Lyman H. Johnson.

Wisler (Old Order Mennonite Church).
1870, in Indiana and Ohio.
Leader: Jacob Wisler.
Some of this group in Pennsylvania, 1893, and Virginia 1901.

Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of America.
1872, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Leaders: The Missouri Ministerium.

REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.
1873, in New York City.
Leader: Bishop G. D. Cummins of Kentucky.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN III.
1870–1880.
This group of Brethren separated from group I over the questions of polity and immortality, previous to 1884. They carried to full extremes the teaching of John Darby, who came to this country from England in 1885.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST SCIENTIST.
1879, first church chartered; 1892, church organized as First Church of Christ Scientist, Boston, Massachusetts.
Leader: Mary Baker Eddy.

APOSTOLIC LUTHERAN CHURCH (FINNISH).
c. 1879.
Leader: Solomon Korteniemi.
Not reported in 1916 *Lutheran Year Book*, but given in *Federal Council Year Book*, 1917, and in *U. S. Census Report*, 1916.

OLD ORDER GERMAN BAPTIST BRETHREN (DUNKARDS).
1881.
An extremely conservative body of Dunkers, the smallest of the four groups.

NEW CONGREGATIONAL METHODIST CHURCH.
1881, in Ware County, Georgia.

AMERICAN RESCUE WORKERS.
1882, in New York.
Leader: Thomas E. Moore.

Brethren Church (Progressive Dunkards).
1882.

Mennonite Brethren in Christ.
1883, in Pennsylvania and Canada.
The result of the union of (1) Evangelical Mennonites of Pennsylvania, 1858; (2) United Mennonites of Canada, 1874; (3) Brethren in Christ of U. S., 1838.

Icelandic Evangelical Lutheran Synod in North America.
1885, in North Dakota and Manitoba.
Leaders: Ministers from Iceland educated in this country.

Swedish Evangelical Missionary Covenant of America.
1885, in middle northwest.
Organized among the Swedish immigrants who were rebels from their state church.

Swedish Evangelical Free Mission.
c. 1885 on, in Boone, Iowa.

Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Synod in North America.
1886, in Pennsylvania.
Leaders: German ministers of liberal tendency.

Church of God as Organized by Christ.
1886, in central west.
Leaders: Circuit preachers of the Mennonite Brethren in Christ denomination.

Apostolic Church.
1888, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Leader: Albert F. Atwood.

CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST JESUS (ADVENTIST).
1888, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Formed from members of Disciples of Christ, Church of the Blessed Hope, The Church of God, and Age to Come Adventist.

CHURCH OF UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST (OLD CONSTITUTION).
1889, at York, Pennsylvania.
Leaders: Bishop Milton Wright and eleven delegates at General Conference.

SUOMI SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA.
1889, at Hancock, Michigan.
Leaders: Four Finnish Lutheran ministers.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN IV.
1890.
Result of a separation from Plymouth Brethren I and III.

GENERAL CHURCH OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.
1890, in Pennsylvania.
Leaders: Revs. R. de Charms and W. H. Benade.

FRIENDS (PRIMITIVE).
c. 1890 on, in Pennsylvania.
Made up of members from the Philadelphia yearly meeting and the Wilburites.

CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN BRETHREN OF AMERICA.
1890, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Leaders: Eight pastors and laymen from five churches in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

HEPHZIBAH FAITH MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION.
1892, at Glenwood, Iowa.
This is composed of a number of independent churches, having no formal creed, and no general class of organization.

LUTHERAN FREE CHURCH (NORWEGIAN).
1893, at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

CHURCH OF DANIEL'S BAND.
1983, in Marine City, St. Clair County, Michigan.
Leaders: Evangelists.
A movement which primarily stresses evangelism. Located in Michigan only.

NATIONAL SPIRITUALISTIC ASSOCIATION.
1893.
A movement due to interest in the writings of Andrew Jackson Davis, the Poughkeepsie seer, the studies and propaganda of Rev. S. D. Brittain, Honorable John W. Edmonds, Dr. George Dexter, and Professor James J. Mapes, resulting in many organizations united under above title.

METROPOLITAN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.
1894, Chicago, Illinois.

CHRISTIAN AND MISSIONARY ALLIANCE.
1895.
Leader: Rev. A. B. Simpson.
The union of the Christian Alliance for Home Work, and the Missionary Alliance for Foreign Work.

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA.
1896, in New York.
Leaders: Mr. and Mrs. Ballington Booth.

United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
1896.
Formed by churches from the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church Association, 1883, and the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1872 and 1894.

Holiness Church.
1896, in southern California.
Leader: Rev. Hardin Wallace.

International Apostolic Holiness Union.
1897, in Cincinnati, Ohio.
Leader: Rev. Martin W. Knapp.

The Missionary Church Association.
1898, in Berne, Indiana.
Organized by believers in the four-fold gospel: regeneration, sanctification, healing and premillenarianism.

Pentecost Bands of the World.
1898, in Indianapolis, Indiana.
Leader: Rev. Vivian A. Dake.

Central Conference of Mennonites (formerly Central Illinois Conference of Mennonites).
1899, in Illinois.
Led by those who did not believe in the rigid rules for membership set up by the Amish Mennonite Church.

The Christian Congregation.
1899, in Kokomo, Indiana.
Grew out of a charity movement.

Peniel Missions.
c. 1900 (?), on the Pacific coast.
Under the general superintendence of the Rev. and Mrs. T. P. Furguson of Los Angeles, California.

Apostolic Faith Movement.
1900, at Topeka, Kansas.
Leader: Rev. Charles T. Forham.

Finnish Evangelical National Church (Lutheran).
1900, in Michigan.
Composed of opponents of the organization of the Suomi Synod.

Lumber Conference.
1900, on in North Carolina.
Leaders: A few Methodist ministers.

Pillar of Fire.
1902, at Denver, Colorado.
Leader: Mrs. Alma White.

Independent Bohemian and Moravian Brethren Church.
1903, at Granger, Texas.
Leaders: Members of four local churches.
Formed to unite four local churches of Bohemian and Moravian Christians.

Conservative Amish Mennonite Church.
1906–1916.
Leaders: Members of Amish Mennonite congregations in the United States and Canada.

Plymouth Brethren VI.
1906.
A separation from group IV over a question of ecclesiastical polity.

CHURCH OF GOD, GENERAL ASSEMBLY.
January, 1907, at Union Grove, Bradley County, Tennessee.
A movement of conservatives from a number of denominations in Tennessee.

PROGRESSIVE SPIRITUALIST CHURCH.
March, 1907, in Chicago, Illinois.
Leader: Rev. G. V. Cordingley.

THE NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.
1907, at Washington, D. C.
This is the date which marks the present denominational organization of the Northern Baptists.

PENTECOSTAL CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE.
1907, in Chicago, Illinois.
Leader: Wm. H. Hoople.
A union of (1) The Association of the Pentecostal Church of America, of Brooklyn, N. Y., 1895, (2) The Central Evangelical Holiness Association of New England, (3) The Church of the Nazarene of Los Angeles, California, 1895.

HUNGARIAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.
October 4, 1907, in New York City.
Leader: Count Joseph Desenfeld, Curator of the German Reformed in Hungary.
This organization seeks to bring together the members in this country of the Reformed Church of Hungary.

PENTECOSTAL HOLINESS CHURCH.
January, 1911, at Falcon, North Carolina.
Leaders: Revivalists.

Church of the Universal Messianic Message.
February, 1911, at Spokane, Washington.
Leader: A. K. Mozunder.

Assemblies of God. General Council.
October, 1914, at Hot Springs, Arkansas, and in Maryland in November of the same year.
Result of a revivalistic movement.

Church Transcendent or Transcendental Way.
1915, at Warren, Ohio.
Organized by people from other denominations and from no denomination.

Plymouth Brethren V.
This body split from the Plymouth Brethren III over a question of discipline. (Even correspondence with the officers of the Bible Truth Depot brought no information as to the date of origin.)

United Lutheran Church in America.
1918, in New York City.
This present title comprises ten Lutheran organizations which extend as separate units back over a century, and it represents the true line of Lutherans since they first came to this country.

APPENDIX B

Almost everyone has heard of the little boy, who, following his father thru the snow, made every effort to step in his father's tracks. From a study of Protestantism among the Negroes, one is tempted to regard that story as a pretty fair description of the way Negroes have stepped in the denominational tracks of their white exemplars. The denominations composed wholly of Negro organizations, as reported in the United States Religious Census for 1916, will show just how well they have done so. Here is the list, with date of organization: Baptist National Convention, 1886 (the first Association in Illinois and Louisiana, 1838); Colored Freewill Baptist, 1901; Colored Primitive Baptist, 1866; Church of God and Saints of Christ, 1896; Church of the Living God, 1889; Church of the Living God, Christian Workers for Fellowship, 1889; Church of the Living God, General Assembly, 1908; Voluntary Missionary Society, 1900; Free Christian Zion Church of Christ, 1905; African Methodist Episcopal, 1816; African Methodist Episcopal Zion, 1820; Colored Methodist Protestant, 1840; Union African Methodist Episcopal, 1813; African Union Methodist Protestant, 1866; Colored Methodist Episcopal, 1866–70; Reform Zion Union Apostolic Methodist, 1869; African American Methodist Episcopal, 1873; Reformed Methodist Union Episcopal, 1884; Colored Cumberland Presbyterian, 1869—nineteen in all.

To be sure, of a total of 4,070,286 members in these nineteen sects, 2,938,579 belong to the National Baptist Convention, and 548,355 to the African Methodist Episcopal

denominations, but that leaves 583,352 members divided among the remaining seventeen sects, ranging between the smallest, of 266, to 257,169, the largest. Besides, there are another 532,519 Negro members in 5,258 local Negro churches which hold their ecclesiastical connection with twenty white denominations, distributed as follows: 10 belong to the Advent Christian; 54 to the Seventh-Day Adventist; 142 to the Northern Baptist Convention; 1 to the Regular Baptist; 111 to the Christian Convention; 87 to the Churches of Christ; 1 to the General Assembly Churches of God; 7 to the General Eldership Churches of God; 154 to the Congregational; 162 to the Disciples of Christ; 6 to the Independent churches; 31 to the Lutheran Synodical Conference; 3,704 to the Methodist Episcopal; 49 to the Methodist Protestant; 16 to the Wesleyan Methodist; 1 to Unitas Fratrum; 434 to the Presbyterian Church (North); 36 to the Presbyterian Church (South); 217 to the Protestant Episcopal; and 35 to the Reformed Episcopal. (Besides, there are 90 churches with 51,688 members which belong to the Roman Catholic Church.) Surely they have followed well the leading of the white race.

As the dates given above show, of the nineteen Negro denominations, only five set up any separate ecclesiastical organization prior to the Civil War, and four of these were in the North. This does not mean, however, that there were no local churches composed wholly of Negro members before that date. The oldest Negro church of which there is a record appears to be a Baptist organization formed prior to 1778, by slaves, near Augusta, Georgia. A Negro Methodist church, organized in New York City in 1797, is only slightly younger. Beginning with these two, in both sections of the country, there were many local Negro organizations, but in the South the religious life of the slaves was

closely connected with the ecclesiastical organizations of the white denominations. With the gift of freedom in 1865, Negro denominations arose rapidly.

The racial factor, before and after the Civil War, was the prime reason for their separate denominations. However, having organized themselves thus, changes and adaptations were made to suit themselves. The denomination which reveals most originality, perhaps, is the Church of God and Saints of Christ. Wm. S. Crowdy, its founder, was a cook on the Santa Fé Railroad when, in the latter part of 1896, he had a vision from God. He quit his work, went into Kansas, began preaching, and soon after organized this sect. In doctrine it teaches that the Negro race is descended from the ten lost tribes of Israel; the Bible is interpreted by the instruction in a pamphlet called *The Seven Keys;* it observes Jewish feast days, Sabbath, and Hebrew names. Its polity is a mixture of Presbyterian and Apostolic practices. Tho there were only two organizations in Kansas in 1916, there were 92 churches in twenty other states—not a bad showing for twenty years of history.

Facts show that all Negro denominations increased in number of organizations, members, and value of church property for the years 1906–1916. (*Bulletin 142*, p. 130, United States Religious Census for 1916.)

Under date of December 19, 1928, the Department of Commerce announces that, according to the returns received, there were in the United States in 1926, 42,585 churches, with a colored membership of 5,203,487, as compared with 39,592 churches and 4,602,805 members in 1916.

The total for 1926 is made up of 24 exclusively colored denominations, with 36,505 churches and 4,558,795 members, and 6,080 churches with 644,692 colored members in 30 white denominations. The corresponding figures for

1916 are 19 exclusively colored denominations with 34,258 churches and 4,070,286 members, and 5,334 Negro churches, with 532,519 members in 21 white denominations. Two of the denominations reported at the Census of 1916, composed exclusively of colored members, have gone out of existence. The data for both Census periods relates to churches composed entirely of Negro members, and the membership reported does not include Negro members belonging to local white churches.

At the Census of 1926 the total expenditures were $43,024,259, as compared with $18,529,827 in 1916. Under this item are included the amount expended for salaries, repairs, etc., for payments on church debt; for benevolences, including home and foreign missions, for denominational support, and for all other purposes.

The value of church edifices in 1926 was $205,782,628, as compared with $86,809,970 in 1916. This item includes any building used mainly for religious services, together with the land on which it stands and all furniture and furnishings owned by the church and actually used in connection with church services. It does not include buildings hired for religious services or those used for social or organization work in connection with the church.

All figures for 1926 are preliminary and subject to correction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

History

General

American History Series, edited by Albert Bushnell Hart (used for reference)
Readings in European History, Robinson
Source Book of American History, Albert Bushnell Hart

Church

A Guide to the Study of Church History, W. J. McGlothlin
Church History, 3 vols., Professor Kurtz
History of the Christian Church, 2 vols., John F. Hurst
A Manual of Church History, 2 vols., A. H. Newman
American Church History Series, 13 vols. (used for reference)
The History of the Church, G. P. Fisher
A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States, A. H. Newman
History of Religion in the United States, H. K. Rowe
The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity, Peter G. Mode
The Baptist Movement in the Continent of Europe, J. H. Rushbrooke
History of the Reformation, Henry C. Vedder

Doctrine

System of Christian Doctrine, Vol. IV, I. A. Dorner
Textbook of the History of Doctrines, Vol. II, Reinhold Seeburg, Hay's Translation
Creeds of Christendom, 3 vols., Philip Schaff (used for reference)
The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons

The Problem of Union

Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities, Committee on the War and Religious Outlook
The Problem of Christian Unity, edited by F. W. Lynch
Living Together, Bishop Francis J. McConnell
The Community Church Movement, Robert H. Lynn
The Union of Christian Forces, R. A. Ashworth
The Community Church, Albert C. Zumbrunnen
The Road to Unity among the Christian Churches, Charles W. Eliot
A Plea for Greater Unity, Seth W. Gilkey
Unity and Missions, Arthur Judson Brown
Library of Christian Co-operation (used for reference)
Imperialistic Religion and the Religion of Democracy, William Adams Brown
The Church in America, Wm. Adams Brown
How to Promote Christian Union, F. D. Kreshner
The Evolution of the Christian Ministry, J. R. Cohn
Six Thousand Country Churches, Gill and Pinchot
Approaches toward Christian Unity, Smythe and Walker
Church Union in Canada, E. Lloyd Morrow
United Churches, Elizabeth R. Hooker
Town and Country Church in the United States, Morse and Brunner
Churches of Distinction in Town and Country, Edmund deS. Brunner
Diagnosing the Rural Church, C. Luther Fry
American Agricultural Villages, Brunner, Hughes and Patten
American Villages, C. Luther Fry
Lausaune 1927, Edward S. Woods.
Lausaune: The Will to Understand, Edmund Davison Soper.
Community Churches, David R. Piper.
Theological Education in America, Robert L. Kelly

What Must the Churches Do to Be Saved, P. Marion Simms
Interchurch Government, Clarence R. Athearn
Community Programs for Co-operating Churches, edited by Roy B. Guild
Churches of the Federal Council, edited by Charles S. MacFarland
Progress of Church Federation, Charles S. MacFarland
Jesus and Our Generation, Charles W. Gilkey
Religion and the New American Democracy, Joseph Ernest McAfee.
Fourteen Rural Surveys, made by the Department of Church and Country Life of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

QUESTIONNAIRES

1. To Postmasters of 250 Towns
2. To Foreign and Home Board Secretaries of all Denominations, and to the State Secretaries of ten Denominations
3. To the Community Churches listed in 1918, and the 115 located in the southern states at the present time
4. To the Church History Professors of all the Seminaries in the United States

PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology of Religious Sects, Henry C. McComas
Social Psychology, Floyd H. Allport
Social Control, E. A. Ross
Christianity and Psychology, F. R. Barry

PERIODICALS

Files of *The Community Churchman*, April, 1921–December, 1922
Files of *The Christian Century*, 1922–present
Files of *The Watchman Examiner*, 1922–present

Files of *The Baptist*, 1922–present
Files of *Christian Work*, 1922–1924
The Christian Union Quarterly, October, 1926; January, 1927 to July, 1928; October, 1917; July, 1926
Home Missions Council Annual Report, 1917 and 1925

GENERAL

United States Government Religious Census Report, 1906 and 1916
Year Book of the Churches, 1917 and 1923
Roger Williams, Oscar Straus
A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, Vols. I and II
The Crisis of the Churches, Leighton Parks
New Churches for Old, John Haynes Holmes
The Future of the Churches, Roger W. Babson
Modern Religious Cults and Movements, Gaius Glenn Atkins
Religion among Men, Committee on the War and Religious Outlook

ADDENDA

The Merging of Subsidiary Units (see page 222)

An illustration of the merging of subsidiary units is that taking place now (1928–1929) in the case of (1) the Lutheran Ministerian of New York, (2) the New York and New England Synod, and (3) the New York Lutheran Synod. While at present these units are all a part of the United Lutheran Church, for the sake of higher efficiency, and a lessening of administrative expenses, they are to be brought under one head. January 25, 1929, is the date set for perfecting the merger plans, and May 29th, 1929, the tentative date for the final vote and putting into effect.

The Christian Church (General Convention) and Congregationalists (see page 232)

These denominations, so similar in doctrine and polity, are apparently well on the road towards definite organic union. At its Quadrennial session of 1919, the General Convention of the Christian Church instructed its commission on Christian unity to make operative a pronouncement to the effect that it stood ready to unite with all true Christians of whatever name or order, provided the basis of union, included among others the following chief points: the government be democratic; the standing of its members be one of equality, and based upon Christian conduct, rather than theological opinions of themselves or others; no test of faith be required other than the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and the Word of God as a standard for the conduct of life

and the guide of the church; and that it be founded in a fellowship resting on righteousness in character and practice.

Of the denominations to which this overture for union was sent, the Congregational responded favourably, and several conferences looking towards the organic union of these two denominations have already been held, the latest of which outlined plans of amalgamation and administration. It is now confidently expected that their respective national organizations meeting in 1929 will take favourable action upon the proposed merger. While it is recognised that the Congregational polity of these particular denominations requires that their state and district or associational bodies, together with the local churches, approve the union in order to make it completely effective, it is believed that if the national bodies so vote, there is little doubt that the smaller units will also.

The Missionary Education Movement (see page 252)

One of the pioneer movements in this group of co-operative agencies is the Missionary Education Movement. It was established in 1902 by the Home and Foreign boards of a large number of Protestant denominations for the twofold purpose of planning and publishing, through a committee representing all the co-operating units, mission study books especially, but also other forms of missionary literature, and for pooling the resources of all the agencies involved, in a program of leadership training through a series of summer conferences held thruout the country. At the present time thirty-five different boards of missions and education, representing seventeen different denominations, maintain this movement and make use of the material thus produced on a co-operative basis. It can easily be seen how significant is

this agency, since the same literature for instruction and propaganda purposes is used by so many Protestant bodies, it illustrates the progress which the co-operative tendency has already made, and in its present healthy state suggests great potential possibilities for the future.

Census of Religious Bodies: 1926

The following figures were received after this book had been put in type. It was, therefore, impossible to include 1926 statistics in the body of the work, and they are, therefore, reprinted here.

Washington, D. C., September 28, 1928.—The Department of Commerce announces that, according to the returns received, there were in the United States in 1926, 213 religious bodies with 231,983 organizations and 54,624,976 members, as compared with 200 denominations reporting 226,718 organizations and 41,926,854 members in 1916. Comparative figures are shown in the following table for number of churches (or other local organizations) and members for the denominations for which data were collected in 1926 and 1916. As the term "members" has a variety of uses, each church was requested to report the number of members according to the definition of membership in that church or organization. In some religious bodies the term member is limited to communicants; in others it includes all baptized persons; and in still others it covers all enrolled persons.

The report for 1916 included statistics for 200 denominations, 19 of which are not shown at this census. Some have joined other denominations and their statistics are included with them, others are out of existence, etc. There are 32 denominations shown at this census not reported in 1916. All of them are not new, however, as a number were created by divisions in denominations which were shown as units in 1916.

At the census of 1926 the total expenditures were $814,371,529, as compared with $328,809,999 in 1916. Under this item are included the amount expended for salaries, repairs, etc., for payments on church debt; for benevolences, including home and foreign missions, for denominational support, and for all other purposes.

The value of church edifices in 1926 was $3,842,577,133, as compared with $1,676,600,582 in 1916. This item includes any building used mainly for religious services, together with the land on which it stands and all furniture and furnishings owned by the church and actually used in connection with church services. It does not include buildings hired for religious services or those used for social or organization work in connection with the church.

All figures for 1926 are preliminary and subject to correction.

SUMMARY OF MORE IMPORTANT STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
All denominations....	231,983	226,718	54,624,976	41,926,854
Adventist Bodies:				
Advent Christian Church.....	444	534	29,430	30,597
Seventh-day Adventist Denomination.....	1,981	2,011	110,998	79,355
Church of God (Adventist).....	58	22	1,686	848
Life and Advent Union.....	7	13	535	658
Churches of God in Christ Jesus (Adventist).....	86	87	3,528	3,457
African Orthodox Church	13	—	1,568	—
African Orthodox Church of New York.....	3	—	717	—

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
American Ethical Union..	6	5	3,801	2,850
American Rescue Workers	97	29	1,989	611
Apostolic Over-Coming Holy Church of God..	16	—	1,047	—
Assemblies of God, General Council.....	671	118	47,950	6,703
Assyrian Jacobite Apostolic Church.....	3	15	1,407	748
Baha'is.....	44	57	1,247	2,884
Baptist Bodies:				
Northern Baptist Convention.....	7,611	[1] 8,319	1,289,966	[1] 1,244,705
Southern Baptist Convention.....	23,374	23,580	3,524,378	2,708,870
Negro Baptists.....	22,081	21,071	3,196,623	2,938,579
General Six Principle Baptists.....	6	10	293	456
Seventh-Day Baptists.	67	68	7,264	7,980
Freewill Baptists.....	1,024	750	79,592	54,833
United American Freewill Baptist Church (Colored).....	166	169	13,396	13,362
Freewill Baptists (Bullockites).....	2	12	36	184
General Baptists.....	465	517	31,501	33,466
Separate Baptists.....	65	46	4,803	4,254
Regular Baptists.....	349	401	23,091	21,521
United Baptists.....	221	254	18,903	22,097
Duck River and Kindred Associations of Baptists (Baptist Church of Christ) ..	98	105	7,340	6,872
Primitive Baptists....	2,267	2,142	81,374	80,311
Colored Primitive Baptists.....	925	336	43,978	15,144
Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists.....	27	48	304	679

[1] Includes Free Baptist.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Independent Baptist Church of America	13	—	222	—
American Baptist Association	1,431	—	117,858	—
Brethren, German Baptists (Dunkers):				
Church of the Brethren (Conservative Dunkers)	1,030	997	128,392	105,102
Old German Baptist Brethren	62	67	3,036	3,399
The Brethren Church (Progressive Dunkers)	174	201	26,026	24,060
Seventh-Day Baptists (German, 1728)	4	5	144	136
Church of God, New Dunkers	9	13	650	929
Brethren, Plymouth:				
Plymouth Brethren I	166	161	4,877	3,896
Plymouth Brethren II	307	129	13,497	5,928
Plymouth Brethren III	24	17	684	476
Plymouth Brethren IV	47	72	1,663	1,389
Plymouth Brethren V	83	80	2,152	1,820
Plymouth Brethren VI	6	10	88	208
Brethren, River:				
Brethren in Christ	81	72	4,320	3,805
Old Order or Yorker Brethren	10	9	472	432
United Zion's Children	28	31	905	1,152
Catholic Apostolic Church	11	13	3,408	2,768
Christadelphians	134	145	3,352	2,922
Christian and Missionary Alliance	332	163	22,737	9,625
Christian Church (General Convention of the Christian Church)	1,044	1,263	112,795	118,737
Christian Science Parent Church	29	—	582	—

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Christian Union	137	220	8,791	13,692
Church of Armenia in America	29	34	28,181	27,450
Church of Christ, Holiness	82	—	4,919	—
Church of Christ, Scientist	1,913	—	202,098	—
Church of God	644	202	23,247	7,784
Church of God (Headquarters, Anderson, Indiana)	932	—	38,249	—
Church of God and Saints of Christ	112	92	6,741	3,311
Church of God in Christ	733	—	30,263	—
Church of the Nazarene	1,444	866	63,558	32,259
Churches of Christ	6,226	5,570	433,714	317,937
Churches of God, Holiness	29	—	2,278	—
Churches of God in North America (General Eldership)	428	440	31,596	28,376
Churches of the Living God:				
Church of the Living God, "The Pillar and Ground of Truth"	81	38	5,844	2,009
Church of the Living God, Christian Workers for Fellowship	149	154	11,558	9,626
Churches of the New Jerusalem:				
General Convention of the New Jerusalem in the United States of America	85	108	5,442	6,352
General Church of the New Jerusalem	13	15	996	733

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Communistic Societies:				
Amana Society	7	7	1,385	1,534
United Society of Believers (Shakers)	6	12	192	367
Congregational Churches	5,028	[2] 5,900	881,696	[2] 809,236
Congregational Holiness Church	25	—	939	—
Disciples of Christ	7,648	8,396	1,377,595	1,226,028
Divine Science Church	22	—	3,466	—
Eastern Orthodox Churches:				
Albanian Orthodox Church	9	2	1,993	410
Bulgarian Orthodox Church	4	4	937	1,992
Greek Orthodox Church (Hellenic)	153	87	119,495	119,871
Roumanian Orthodox Church	34	2	18,853	1,994
Russian Orthodox Church	199	169	95,134	99,681
Serbian Orthodox Church	17	12	13,775	14,301
Syrian Orthodox Church	30	25	9,207	11,591
Evangelical Church	2,054	2,592	206,080	210,530
Evangelical Congregational Church	153	—	20,449	—
Evangelical Synod of North America	1,287	1,331	314,518	339,853
Evangelistic Associations:				
Apostolic Christian Church	53	54	5,709	4,766
Apostolic Faith Mission	14	24	2,119	2,196
Christian Congregation	2	7	150	645

[2] Includes Evangelical Protestant Church of North America.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Church of Daniel's Band	4	6	129	393
Church of God as Organized by Christ	19	17	375	227
Hephzibah Faith Missionary Association	14	12	495	352
Metropolitan Church Association	40	7	1,113	704
Missionary Church Association	34	25	2,498	1,554
Missionary Bands of the World	11	10	241	218
Pillar of Fire	48	21	2,442	1,129
Church of God (Apostolic)	18	—	492	—
Federated Churches	361	—	59,977	—
Free Christian Zion Church of Christ	5	35	187	6,225
Free Church of God in Christ	19	—	874	—
Friends:				
Society of Friends (Orthodox)	715	805	91,326	92,379
Religious Society of Friends (Hicksite)	128	166	16,105	17,170
Orthodox Conservative Friends (Wilburite)	41	50	2,966	3,373
Friends (Primitive)	1	2	25	60
Holiness Church	32	33	861	926
Independent Churches	257	613	34,501	56,757
Jewish Congregations	2,953	1,619	4,087,357	[3] 357,135
Latter-day Saints:				
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	1,275	965	542,194	403,388
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	592	565	64,367	58,941
Liberal Catholic Church	39	—	1,799	—

[3] Seat holders and contributors only.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Liberal Churches	3	—	358	—
Lithuanian National Catholic	[4] 1	7	[4] 492	7,343
Lutheran Bodies:				
United Lutheran Church in America	3,650	3,559	1,214,340	763,596
Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America	1,180	1,165	311,425	204,417
Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of America	4,752	3,620	1,292,620	777,701
Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States	3,917	—	1,040,275	—
Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States	709	—	229,242	—
Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Synod of the United States of America	55	—	14,759	—
Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church	71	—	8,344	—
Norwegian Lutheran Church of America	2,554	2,740	496,707	318,650
Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States	872	826	247,783	164,968
Lutheran Synod of Buffalo	41	42	9,267	6,128
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (Eielsen Synod)	15	20	1,087	1,206

[4] Returns incomplete to date.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and Other States	873	977	217,873	130,793
Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	96	101	18,921	14,544
Icelandic Evangelical Lutheran Synod in North America	14	14	2,186	1,830
Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, or Suomi Synod	185	134	32,071	18,881
Lutheran Free Church	393	376	46,366	28,180
United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	190	192	29,198	17,324
Finnish Evangelical Lutheran National Church of America	70	64	7,788	7,933
Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Church	138	47	24,016	6,664
Church of the Lutheran Brethren in America	26	23	1,700	892
Evangelical Lutheran Jehovah Conference	3	6	851	831
Independent Lutheran Congregations	50	—	11,804	—
Mennonite Church:				
Mennonite Church	295	307	34,039	34,965
Hutterian Brethren, Mennonites	6	17	700	982
Conservative Amish Mennonite Church	7	13	691	1,066
Old Order Amish Mennonite Church	71	88	6,006	7,665
Church of God in Christ (Mennonite)	26	21	1,832	1,125

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Old Order Mennonite Church (Wisler)....	19	22	2,227	1,608
Reformed Mennonite Church.....	31	29	1,117	1,281
General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America.....	136	113	21,582	15,407
Defenseless Mennonites.....	10	11	1,060	854
Mennonite Brethren in Christ.....	99	108	5,882	4,737
Mennonite Brethren Church of North America.....	61	53	6,484	5,127
Krimmer Brueder—Gemeinde.....	14	13	797	894
Mennonite Kleine Gemeinde.....	4	3	214	171
Central Conference of Mennonites.....	29	17	3,124	2,101
Conference of the Defenseless Mennonites of North America ..	9	15	818	1,171
Stauffer Mennonite Church.....	4	5	243	209
Unaffiliated Mennonite Churches.....	5	—	348	—
Methodist Bodies:				
Methodist Episcopal Church.....	26,130	29,315	4,080,777	3,717,785
Methodist Protestant Church.....	2,239	2,473	192,171	186,908
Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America	619	579	21,910	20,778
Primitive Methodist Church in the United States of America...	80	93	11,990	9,353

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Methodist Episcopal Church, South	18,096	19,184	2,487,694	2,114,479
Congregational Methodist Church	145	197	9,691	12,503
Free Methodist Church of North America	1,375	1,598	36,374	35,291
New Congregational Methodist Church	26	24	1,229	1,256
Holiness Methodist Church, Lumbee River Conference	7	6	459	434
Reformed Methodist Church	14	—	390	—
African Methodist Episcopal Church	6,708	6,633	545,814	548,355
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	2,466	2,716	456,813	257,169
Colored Methodist Protestant Church	3	26	533	1,967
Union American Methodist Episcopal Church	73	67	10,169	3,624
African Union Methodist Protestant Church	43	58	4,086	3,751
Colored Methodist Episcopal Church	2,518	2,621	202,713	245,749
Reformed Zion Union Apostolic Church	48	47	4,538	3,977
Reformed Methodist Union Episcopal Church	25	27	2,265	2,196
Independent African Methodist Episcopal Church	29	—	1,003	—
Moravian Bodies:				
Moravian Church in America	127	110	31,699	26,373

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Evangelical Unity of Bohemian and Moravian Brethren in North America	34	23	5,241	1,714
Bohemian and Moravian Brethren Churches	3	3	303	320
New Apostolic Church	25	20	2,938	3,828
Old Catholic Churches in America:				
Old Catholic Church in America	9	12	1,888	4,700
American Catholic Church	11	3	1,367	475
North American Old Roman Catholic Church	27	—	14,793	—
The (Original) Church of God	50	—	1,869	—
The Pentecostal Assemblies of the World	126	—	7,850	—
Pentecostal Holiness Church	252	192	8,096	5,353
Pilgrim Holiness Church	441	169	15,040	5,276
Polish National Catholic Church	89	34	60,974	28,245
Presbyterian Bodies:				
Presbyterian Church in the United States of America	8,947	[5] 9,773	1,894,030	[5] 1,625,817
Cumberland Presbyterian Church	1,097	1,313	67,938	72,052
Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church	178	136	10,868	13,077
United Presbyterian Church of North America	901	991	171,571	160,726
Presbyterian Church in the United States	3,469	3,365	451,043	357,769

[5] Includes Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Associate Synod of North America (Associate Presbyterian Church)	11	12	329	490
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church	143	133	20,410	15,124
Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America	89	103	7,166	8,185
Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, General Synod	13	14	1,929	2,386
Protestant Episcopal Church	7,299	7,345	1,859,086	1,092,821
Reformed Bodies:				
Reformed Church in America	717	715	153,739	144,929
Reformed Church in the United States	1,709	1,758	361,286	344,374
Christian Reformed Church	245	226	98,534	38,668
Free Magyar Reformed Church in America	11	[6]	3,992	—
Reformed Episcopal Church	69	74	8,651	11,050
Roman Catholic Church	18,940	17,375	18,605,003	15,721,815
Salvation Army	1,052	742	74,768	35,954
Scandinavian Evangelical Bodies:				
Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America	357	324	36,838	29,164
Swedish Evangelical Free Church of the United States of America	107	102	8,166	6,208

[6] Figures included in "Other denominations," not comparable with 1926.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS, BY DENOMINATIONS: 1926—*Continued*

Denomination	*Churches*		*Membership*	
	1926	*1916*	*1926*	*1916*
Norwegian and Danish Evangelical Free Church, Association of North America..	41	32	3,781	2,444
Schwenkfelders.....	6	6	1,596	1,127
Social Brethren.....	22	19	1,214	950
Spiritualists:				
National Spiritualists' Association.....	543	343	41,233	23,197
Progressive Spiritual Church.....	9	11	7,383	5,831
National Spiritual Alliance of the United States of America...	59	—	2,015	—
Temple Society of America.....	2	2	164	260
Theosophical Societies:				
Theosophical Society of New York, Independent.....	1	1	55	72
American Theosophical Society.....	223	157	7,448	5,097
Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society.....	1	—	50,000	—
Unitarians.....	353	411	60,152	82,515
United Brethren Bodies:				
Church of the United Brethren in Christ ..	2,988	3,481	377,436	348,828
Church of the United Brethren in Christ (Old Constitution) ..	372	408	17,872	19,106
United Christian Church.....	15	—	577	—
Universalists.....	498	643	54,957	58,566
Vedanta Society.....	3	3	200	190
Volunteers of America ..	133	97	28,756	10,204
Other denominations[7]...	—	144	—	30,492

[7] Not reported in 1926.

Church Membership and Property, by States: 1926

(Compiled by the United States Census Bureau and supplied by the *World Almanac*)

States	Members	S. S. Scholars	Church Edifices	Value	Expended in 1926	Debt
	No.	No.	No.	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
Alabama	1,217,170	604,256	8,836	47,727,675	12,202,007	4,555,852
Arizona	153,086	44,968	436	4,948,775	1,347,943	423,903
Arkansas	621,307	385,369	5,678	27,064,498	7,491,618	2,926,519
California	1,567,511	607,766	4,107	118,955,120	31,447,370	19,269,080
Colorado	352,863	163,692	1,383	22,713,155	5,837,497	3,248,309
Connecticut	956,458	177,098	1,501	73,794,795	13,566,538	6,926,562
Delaware	110,142	53,883	481	11,276,836	1,943,766	801,177
Dist. of Columbia	238,871	83,422	355	32,351,870	6,022,286	3,660,469
Florida	528,465	314,060	3,943	54,312,211	13,595,515	7,199,395
Georgia	1,350,184	567,449	9,281	52,657,249	12,252,739	3,571,795
Idaho	162,679	85,580	851	7,199,660	1,730,793	645,530
Illinois	3,357,954	1,084,348	9,055	267,160,486	59,431,153	35,004,694
Indiana	1,382,816	773,970	6,514	109,400,387	22,923,895	12,092,442
Iowa	1,080,156	534,220	5,035	80,045,421	18,209,800	5,826,906
Kansas	766,578	488,590	4,232	54,746,202	13,964,541	5,900,143
Kentucky	1,051,504	496,109	6,419	60,245,842	12,397,663	5,103,174
Louisiana	1,037,008	242,837	3,781	35,746,390	8,454,531	3,982,474
Maine	294,092	106,737	1,397	19,186,647	4,617,856	1,528,023
Maryland	758,046	329,644	2,884	65,776,138	13,719,992	8,251,877
Massachusetts	2,500,204	496,375	3,175	177,275,721	34,624,684	14,997,890
Michigan	1,787,023	662,598	5,247	114,290,055	25,926,561	12,306,539
Minnesota	1,282,188	353,294	4,780	82,460,438	19,639,054	9,481,197
Mississippi	800,729	385,985	7,233	27,602	7,990,055	2,176,745
Missouri	1,581,278	649,540	7,306	110,022,697	22,990,944	9,837,228
Montana	152,387	62,587	914	8,367,362	1,949,976	811,105
Nebraska	561,423	268,423	2,789	39,377,144	10,036,396	3,853,006
Nevada	19,769	8,110	102	1,017,900	284,062	132,553
New Hampshire	223,674	62,219	807	15,116,044	2,889,408	1,115,029
New Jersey	1,981,584	489,541	3,495	162,694,034	33,833,658	20,256,860
New Mexico	215,547	40,436	817	4,361,099	1,113,266	345,673
New York	6,796,142	1,149,507	9,734	601,651,591	101,586,478	77,986,574
North Carolina	1,406,883	953,153	9,592	80,471,664	17,904,444	7,714,936
North Dakota	304,963	103,589	2,200	14,926,580	3,673,902	1,384,853
Ohio	2,866,496	1,330,843	9,326	255,063,123	51,901,279	32,176,346
Oklahoma	581,083	419,295	4,205	37,610,399	10,744,722	6,073,116
Oregon	252,731	142,997	1,364	17,326,319	4,469,148	2,133,491
Pennsylvania	5,212,050	2,092,875	13,327	439,852,704	85,849,995	44,718,385
Rhode Island	451,395	85,942	511	23,990,162	5,715,151	1,953,597
South Carolina	872,806	507,235	5,483	37,109,027	8,109,796	3,023,233
South Dakota	294,622	123,270	1,982	17,285,300	4,378,366	1,508,419
Tennessee	1,018,071	602,776	7,682	54,537,168	12,422,225	5,852,999
Texas	2,280,514	1,102,294	12,770	109,736,370	28,925,421	13,546,556
Utah	369,591	117,442	619	13,546,969	2,172,773	702,451
Vermont	161,123	45,872	763	12,235,165	2,212,636	307,037
Virginia	1,172,363	687,960	7,213	74,633,081	15,214,511	8,349,756
Washington	384,222	219,271	2,002	26,758,137	7,792,816	4,546,298
West Virginia	532,106	387,285	4,286	41,058,955	8,431,372	4,619,943
Wisconsin	1,473,064	310,540	4,648	93,190,969	19,535,325	9,965,673
Wyoming	62,975	30,749	335	3,857,900	938,818	348,696
Total United States	56,150,322	21,040,861	210,876	2,905,161,026	814 414,745	432,407,602

INDEX

Abbott, Dr. Lyman, 257.
Ackerman, Dr. Carl, quoted, 222.
Advent Christian Church, 43, 309.
Adventist sects, 42, 43, 48, 307, 309, 310, 313.
Alabama, denominations in, 112, 122.
Alaska, Home Missions work in, 136.
Albany, Bishop of, quoted, 196–197.
Albright, Jacob, 52, 305.
Amana Society, 24, 300.
American Bible Society, 246–247.
American Board of Conference on Foreign Missions, 208.
American Indians. *See* Indians.
American Institute of Social Service, 254.
American Red Cross, 254.
American Rescue Workers, 28, 311.
American Systematic Beneficence Society, 247–248.
American Tract Society, 247.
Amish Mennonites, 21, 49, 299, 310.
Anabaptists, 11; creed drawn up by, 13; persecution of, 18; interpretation of Lord's Supper held by, 38; theory of baptism held by, 40; church polity of, 47.
Andrews, Bishop, 307.
Anglican Church, creed drawn up by, 13; theory of baptism held by, 39; fight between Presbyterians and, 17.
Anthony, Dr. A. W., 163, 165.
Anti-Pedobaptist denominations, 44.
Anti-Saloon League of America, 250.
Anti-Trinitarians, 11.
Apostolic Christian Church, 42, 308.
Apostolic Church, 56, 312.
Apostolic Faith Movement, 52, 316.
Apostolic Lutheran Church (Finnish), 311.
Argentina, co-operative movements in, 207.
Arizona, denominations in, 112.
Arkansas, denominations in, 112, 122.
Arminians, the, 11, 41–42.
Arminius, James, 41, 62.
Ashworth, Dr. Robert A., quoted, 87.
Assemblies of God, 318.
Associate Presbyterian Church, origin of, 48.
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, 48, 306.
Associate Synod of North America, 27, 28, 304.
Association of the Pentecostal Church of America, 317.
Athearn, Dr. Walter S., quoted, 102.
Atwood, Albert F., 312.
Augsburg, Conference of, 14–15.
Augsburg Confession, 12.
Augustana Synod, 303.
Ausschuss der Deutschen Evangelische Missionen, 212.

Backus, Isaac, 304.
Baldwin, Matthew W., 247.
Bancroft, Richard, 46.
Baptism, function, subject, and mode of, 38–40.
Baptist denomination, 11, 27, 28, 66, 68, 114, 298; creeds drawn up by, 13; internal struggle within, 16; establishment of, in New England, 21; persecution of, 33; interpretation of Lord's Supper held by, 38; theory of baptism held by, 40; question of membership in, 44; church polity of, 47; effect of slavery on, 60–61; education promoted by, 72, 73; area covered by, 114, 121, 122, 123, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134; work of, in Haiti, 147; co-operation within, 224. *See also:* Northern Baptist Convention; Southern Baptist Convention.
Baptist Brethren. *See* German Baptist Brethren.
Baptist Churches of Christ (Duck River), 305.
Baptist sects, 38, 41, 42, 44, 50, 51, 56, 59, 60, 61, 298, 299, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311, 317.
Baptist World's Alliance, 224.
Barclay, Robert, 14, 62.
Basel, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Bates, Joseph, 307.
Bean, Charles, 308.
Beecher, Henry Ward, cited, 85.
Beissel, John Conrad, 304.
Belgic Creed, 12.
Belgium, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Bell, Bishop William M., 231.
Benade, Rev. W. H., 313.
Berne, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Beza, Theodore, 62.
Bible, vernacular translations of, 7; Tyndale's translation of, 10; denominational interpretations of, 57–59; exaltation of, 67. *See also* New Testament.
Bible and Training schools, 72.
Biel, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Bigotry, growth of, among Protestants, 19.
Boehm, Martin, 305.
Bohemia, Protestantism in, 8, 11.
Bohemian Brethren, creeds drawn up by, 12; persecution of, 18.
Bolivia, co-operative movements in, 207.
Boniface VIII, 5.
Book of Common Prayer, 10.
Booth, Mr. and Mrs. Ballington, 314.
Boston University, 71.
Bourne, Hugh, 24.
Boy Scouts, 254.
Brazil, co-operative movements in, 207.
Brethren in Christ, 21, 300.
Brethren Church (Progressive Dunkards), 312.
Brinser, Matthias, 309.
Brittain, Rev. S. D., 314.
Brooks, Phillips, quoted, 201, 257–258.
Brown, Nicholas, 71, 298, 303.
Brown University, 71.
Browne, Robert, 62.
Bucer, Martin, 15.
Buffalo Synod of the Lutheran Church, 24, 50, 301.
Bullinger, Heinrich, 62.
Bullock, Jeremiah, 308.
Bullockites. *See* Freewill Baptists.
Buzzell, John, 308.

California, denominations in, 123.
Calixtines, the, 11.
Calvin, John, 16, 62; theory of,

concerning Lord's Supper, 37, 38.
Calvinism, five points of, 40.
Calvinistic Reformed Church, 11.
Calvinists, the, 11.
Cambridge University, 70.
Campbell, Alexander, 55, 305.
Campbell, Thomas, 55, 305.
Canons of the Synod of Dort, 12.
Capito, Wolfgang Fabricius, 15.
Carriccioli, Galeazzo, 7.
Carroll, Dr., quoted, 81.
Catholic Apostolic Church, 24, 43, 53, 301.
Census, statistics of Federal, 79–82.
Centerton, Arkansas, interdenominational co-operation in, 107.
Central Conference of Mennonites, 315.
Central Evangelical Holiness Association of New England, 317.
Channing, W. E., 305.
Charles I, 16.
Charles II, 17.
Charles V, 5–6.
Chengtu, University of, 209.
Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 234.
Chicago University. *See* University of Chicago.
Chili, co-operative movements in, 207.
China, policy of territorial delimitation in, 208.
Christadelphian sects, 28, 44, 308.
Christian III, 9.
Christian Alliance, 226.
Christian Alliance for Home Work, 314.
Christian Congregation, 315.
Christian and Missionary Alliance, 226, 314.
Christian Church of China, 211.
Christian College for Women in Madras, 209.
Christian Communion denomination, 56.
Christian Congregation denomination, 56.
Christianity, spiritual versus formal, 53.
Christian Reformed denomination, 24, 301.
Christians Church, 305.
Christian Science. *See* Church of Christ Scientist.
Christian Union, 309.
Church-building, increase in, 81–82.
Churches, property valuation of, 82; surplus of, 86–88; indiscriminate locating of, 88–93; inadequacy of, 100–102; competition among, 137–142; problems of town and country, 156–160.
Church government, forms and functions of, 45–48.
Church membership, 44–45, 79–80, 86–87.
Church of Christ, 307.
Church of Christ Scientist, 26, 65, 113, 311.
Church of Daniel's Band, 314.
Church of England, theories of government held by, 46.
Church of God (New Dunkards), 308.
Church of God, Adventist, 42, 48, 310.
Church of God in Christ (Mennonite), 56, 309.
Church of God in Christ Jesus (Adventist), 313.
Church of God, General Assembly, 317.
Church of God in North America (Winebrennerians), 306.
Church of God as organized by Christ (Mennonite), 312.

Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, 26, 63–64, 114, 122, 307.
Church of the Lutheran Brethren of America, 313.
Church of the Nazarene, of Los Angeles, 317.
Church of the New Jerusalem, 24, 49–50, 54, 313.
Church of the Transcendental Way, 318.
Church of United Brethren in Christ, 313.
Church of the Universal Messianic Message, 318.
Church polity, forms of, 45–48.
Church program, 102–104.
Church quarters, inadequacy of, 100–102.
Church Transcendent, 318.
Church union, questionnaire on, 125–128.
Church unity, barriers to, 266.
Clarke, John, 298.
Clement V, Pope, 5.
Cleveland Plan of Union, 230.
Cognac, League of, 9.
Colet, John, 10.
Colgate University, 71.
College of New Jersey, 71.
Collegiate School of Connecticut, 70.
Colloquy at Leipzig, 15.
Colorado, number of denominations in, 112.
Columbia University, 71.
Comity, principles of, 148–152.
Committee on co-operation in Latin America, 206.
Communicants, census of, 79–80.
Community choir, 263.
Community Church, development of the, 156, 166–171; Pepperell and Latitudinarian types of, 171–172; federated type of, 172–174; undenominational type of, 174–177; denominational type of, 177–179; affiliated type of, 179–180; merits of, 180–182; town and country problem solved by, 182–184; better work accomplished by, 184–185; support of missions by, 185–187; enlarged local program of, 188–190; movement toward, in the South, 190–193; opinion of pastors on, 193–195. *See also* Co-operation.
Community Churchman, The, 168, 171, 180, 190.
Community of True Inspiration. *See* Amana Society.
Community work, 263–264.
Competition, degree of, among churches, 139–142.
Conference of Defenseless Mennonites of North America, 25, 302.
Conference of Foreign Mission Boards and Societies in the United States and Canada, 212–213.
Confession of Faith, Protestant, 8; Knox's, 10; denominational, 12–14; Hungarian, 13.
Confessio Pentapolitana, 13.
Conformists, internal struggle among, 15–16.
Congregational Church, 11, 122, 123, 297; creed drawn up by, 14; establishment of, at Plymouth, 20–21; theory of baptism held by, 39; polity of, 47; state distribution of, 113, 122, 123, 124, 130, 132.
Congregational form of government, 46–47.
Congregational Methodist Church, 47, 308.

Congregationalists, internal struggle among, 16; Plan of Union between Presbyterians and, 229–230; proposed plan of union between Universalists and, 230–231; resolutions of, toward unity, 233–234; and the Christian Church, 231, 328.
Connecticut, number of denominations in, 112.
Consensus of Sendomir, The, 13.
Conservatism, Progressivism versus, 48–50.
Conservative Amish Mennonite Church, 316.
Cooley, William, 309.
Co-operation, interdenominational, 106–107, 124–132, 149–155; denominational, 124–132; the "United" churches and, 166 ff.; attitude of board officials toward foreign, 216–218; encouraging aspects of, 159–160; questionnaire concerning, 161–162; denominational attitudes toward, 164–165; future of, on foreign fields, 219–220; denominational movements toward, 221–238; movement toward federal and administrative, 238–244; undenominational movements toward, 244–259; impossibility to check, 260; unconscious preparation for, 260–264; the radio a contribution to, 264–265; propaganda necessary for, 265–266; past training a barrier to, 266–268; sectarian pride a barrier to, 268–271; emphasis on likenesses and similarities assets to, 271–277; need for leaders for, 277–278, 293–295; educational training for, 278–282; a questionnaire on, 282–293; Baptist attitude toward, 288–289; Congregational attitude toward, 289–290; Lutheran attitude toward, 290; Methodist attitude toward, 290–291; Presbyterian attitude toward, 291; Episcopal attitude toward, 292; leaders in training for, 293–295. *See also* Interdenominational co-operation.
Cordingly, Rev. G. V., 317.
Country church problem, town and, 156–160, 182–190.
Cowdery, Oliver, 63.
Cranmer, Thomas, 16, 310.
Creeds. *See* Confession of faith.
Cromwell, Oliver, 17.
Crowdy, William S., 321.
Cuba, Home Missions work in, 136; co-operation movements in, 207.
Cumberland Presbyterian Church, 51, 52, 86, 132, 223, 305.
Cummings, Jonathan, 309.
Cummins, Bishop G. D., 311.
Czenger, Reformed Synod of, 13.

Dake, Rev. Vivian A., 315.
Danish Evangelical Church in America, 25.
Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 302.
Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church Association, 315.
Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 315.
Darby, John, 311.
Dartmouth College, 72.
Davis, Andrew Jackson, 314.
Debts, burden of church, 88.
"Decades," Bullinger's, 16.
De Charms, Rev. S., 313.
Declaration Concerning Unity, 232.
Defenseless Mennonite Church, 25, 45, 309.

Deindorfer, J., 309.
Delaware, Lutheran Church in, 21; denominations in, 112, 122.
Denmark, rise of Protestantism in, 9, 12.
Denominationalism, European, 11 ff.; establishment of, in Colonial America, 20 ff.; effect of personality on, 61–63; appeal of, to the masses, 74–76; psychological advantages of, 76–78; achievements of, 79–83; weaknesses in, 84–107; proposed remedies for faults of, 104–107; benefits of, 194–195.
Denominations, transplanting of European, 22–26; rise of native, 26–28; European influence on native, 28–29; frontier influence on, 30–32; politico-religious theories of, 32–33; philosophical individualism of, 33–35; differences in theological beliefs among, 36–44; differences among, regarding church membership, 44–45; differences in church polity among, 45–48; progressive and conservative differences among, 48–53; search for unity among, 54–57; interpretation variations among, 57–59; divisive social and personal factors among, 59–63; indigenous, 63–65; cessation from division among, 65–66; growth of mutual respect between, 69; education promoted by, 71–73; numerical growth among, 79–82; state distribution of, 111–118; relative influence of, 117–118; growth of small, 118–121; state preferences for, 121–125; influence of cooperation on, 124–132; distribution of members among, 132–134; plans for organic union between, 227–238; sectarian pride among, 268–271; points of likeness between, 271–277; Negro, 319–321.
Desenfeld, Count Joseph, 317.
Dexter, Dr. George, 314.
Dexter, Gregory, 298, 300.
Diet of Spires, 9.
Diet of Westeras, 9.
Disciples of Christ, 28, 123, 305; Christadelphians an offshoot of, 43–44; origin of, 56; state distribution of, 113, 123, 124, 130, 132; resolutions of, toward unity, 234.
District of Columbia, number of denominations in, 112.
Disunion, causes of denominational, 36 ff.
Dort, Canons of the Synod of, 12.
Dort, Synod of, 15.
Duck River Baptists, 42, 59, 305.
Duke University, 72.
Dunkards (Dunkers), 50, 299, 304, 308, 311, 312. *See:* Brethren Church; Church of God; German Baptist Brethren; Old Order German Baptist Brethren; Progressive Dunkards.
Dutch Reformed Church, establishment of, at New Amsterdam, 21; education fostered by, 71. *See* Reformed Church of North America.

Ecumenical Missionary Conference, 213.
Eddy, Mary Baker, 65, 311.
Edict of Nantes, 8.
Edict of Nismes, 8.
Edmonds, Hon. John W., 314.
Education, denominational institutions of, 69–73; immigrant,

73–74; Home Missions contribution to, 135; co-operation in, on foreign field, 209–211; economic gain in co-operative, 211; training furnished by institutions for, 278–282; theological, 278–295. *See also* Seminaries.
Edward III, 5.
Edward VI, 16.
Egli, Henry, 309.
Eilsen, Ellen, 308.
Eilsen Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 45, 50, 308.
Eliot, Dr. Charles W., quoted, 281.
Elon College, 72.
Embry, Philip, 304.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 85.
England, rise of Protestantism in, 10–11.
English Reformed Church, form of government of, 46.
Episcopal Church. *See* Protestant Episcopal Church. *See also* Reformed Episcopal Church.
Episcopal form of government, 45, 46, 47, 48.
Episcopalians, the, 11.
Evangelical Alliance, 245–246.
Evangelical Association, 29, 51, 52, 305.
Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and other states, 306; adherence of, to Arminianism, 41–42.
Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 48, 50.
Evangelical Lutheran Jehovah Conference, 25, 302.
Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of America, 221, 310.
Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and other states, 28, 309.
Evangelical Protestant Church of North America, 25, 226, 302; proposed plan of union between United Brethren and, 231–232.
Evangelical Society of the East, 300.
Evangelical Union, Porto Rico, 146.
Evangelical Union of Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, 24–25, 301.
Evangelism, co-operation in, on foreign field, 209.
Ewing, Rev. Finis, 305.
Eyman, Peter, 308.

Fairmount, West Virginia, community work in, 263.
Faith Association Group, 308.
Fambro, William, 308.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 133, 238, 240–244.
Federation, attitude toward denominational, 124–132; statistics concerning, 167–171. *See also* Co-operation.
Federation of Christian Forces in India, 211.
Ferdinand, King, 8.
Ferrara, Duchess of, 7.
Finance, achievement in church, 82; burden of church, 88.
Finney, Charles G., 252.
Finnish Evangelical National Church (Lutheran), 48, 316.
Five Arminian Articles, 41.
Fleck, J. F. V., 309.
Florence Crittenden Mission, 254.
Florida, number of denominations in, 112.
Foochow Theological Seminary, 210.
Foochow Union Medical School, 210.
Foochow Union Training School for Teachers, 210.

Foot-washing, 57, 59.
Foreigners, Home Missions work among, 136.
Foreign missions, 81; necessity for co-operation in, 196 ff.; magnitude of the task, 196–198; proportionate share of workers, 198–199; unification for power, 199–200; sectarianism in, 200–202; native demand for unity in, 202–205; achievements in co-operation in, 206 ff.; work toward territorial delimitation in, 208–209; evangelistic co-operation, 209; co-operation in education, 209–211; Boards of, 212–216; attitude of Board officials toward co-operation on field of, 216–219; future of co-operation in, 219–220.
Foreign workers, distribution of, 198–199.
Forham, Rev. Charles T., 316.
Formula of Concord (Lutheran), 12.
Fortune, Dr. A. N., quoted, 266.
Fox, George, 53, 62.
France, Protestantism in, 7–8, 11.
Francis I, 7–8.
Frederick III, Elector, 15.
Free Baptist Church, 27, 305; adherence of, to Arminianism, 41.
Freeman, James, 305.
Free Methodist Church, 309; polity of, 47–48.
Freewill Baptist Church, 27, 304, 308; attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38; adherence of, to Arminianism, 41.
Frelinghuysen, Theodorus J., 71.
Friends, Hicksite, 306; Wilburites, 308; Primitive, 313. *See* Quakers.
Friends of the Temple, 24, 44, 301.
Froelick, Rev. S. H., 308.
Fukien Union College of Liberal Arts, 210.
Fuller, Dr. Richard, 60.
Furguson, Rev. and Mrs. T. P., 316.

Gallican Creed, 12.
Geddes, Jenny, 17.
General Baptists, 13, 40.
General Church of the New Jerusalem, 313.
General Conference of Free Baptists, 224.
General Conference of Mennonites of North America, 50, 308.
General Convention of the New Jerusalem in U. S. A., 300.
General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, origin of, 50.
General Synod of Reformed Presbyterian Church in America, 306.
Geneva, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Georgia, denominations in, 112, 122.
German Baptist Brethren, 21, 53, 299. *See also* Old Order German Baptist Brethren.
German Evangelical Ministers' Conference, 226.
German Evangelical Protestant Ministers Association, 29, 226.
German Evangelical Society of Ohio, 300.
German Evangelical Synod of North America, 24, 300.
German Lutheran Church, establishment of, in Colonial America, 21.
German Reformed Church, establishment of, in Colonial America, 21; Presbyterian form of government of, 45, 46. *See*

Reformed Church of the United States.
German Seventh-Day Baptist Church, 27, 28, 42, 304.
Germany, rise of Protestantism in, 9, 11.
Gideons, the, 254.
Gingling College for Women, 209.
Girl Scouts, 254.
Givin, Rev. J. F., 309.
Gloucester, Bishop of, quoted, 237–238.
Grossman, G., 309.
Guilford College, 72.
Gurney, Joseph, 308.
Gustavus Adolphus, 9.

Haiti, Home Missions work in, 147.
Haldeman, John, 309.
Hall, Joseph, 46.
Hamilton, Patrick, 10.
Hammond, Henry, 46.
Hampton Court Conference, 16.
Harvard, Rev. John, 70.
Harvard University, 70.
Hauge's Synod, 53, 303.
Heavenly Recruit Association, 52.
Heck, Barbara, 304.
Hedio (Heid), 15.
Heidelberg Catechism, 13, 15.
Henry II, 8.
Henry VIII, 10, 16, 62.
Hephzibah Faith Missionary Association, 42, 314.
Heppe, Professor, cited, 12.
Herr, Francis, 306.
Herr, John, 306.
Heshusius, Professor, fight between Klebitz and, 15.
Hicks, Elias, 306.
High Church party, 17.
Hobart, Bishop, 71.
Hobart College, 71.
Hoehman, A. Mark, 53.
Holiness Church, 315.
Holland, rise of Protestantism in, 9–10, 11.
Home and Foreign Missionary Work Society, 226.
Home Missions, the frontier a field for, 30; gifts for, 81; expenditures of, 135–136; aid of, to competing churches, 137–142; work of, among immigrant, migrant, and Spanish-speaking groups, 145–148; state co-operation in, 152–155; efficiency of, considered, 160–165.
Home Missions Council, 143–155; work of, among English-speaking churches, 148; comity principles of, 148–152; state councils' work with, 152–155; town and country church problems met by, 156–160; survey undertaken by, 156–159; co-operation promoted by, 167.
Hooker, Elizabeth R., cited and quoted, 168, 170, 171, 174, 179.
Hooker, Richard, 46.
Hoople, William H., 317.
Horton, Jotham, 307.
Hubbard, Samuel, 304.
Huguenots, the, 11, 18.
Huneker, James, 75–76.
Hungarian Confession of Faith, 13.
Hungarian Reformed Church in America, 317.
Hungary, Protestantism in, 8, 11; creed drawn up in, 13.
Huss, John, 6.
Hutterian Brethren Mennonite Church, 25, 302.

Icelandic Evangelical Lutheran Synod in North America, 312.
Idaho, number of denominations in, 112; State Home Missions Council in, 154.
Illinois, denominations in, 111,

124; denominational distribution in, 116–117.
Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Synod in North America, 48, 50, 312.
Immersion, doctrine of, 40.
Immigrants, education provided for, 73; work of Home Missions Council for, 145–146.
Immortality, doctrine of, 42.
Independent Bohemian and Moravian Brethren Church, 316.
"Independent Churches," distribution of, 114.
India, policy of territorial delimitation in, 208.
Indiana, denominations in, 111, 122.
India National Conference, quoted, 203–204.
Indians, early missionary motives toward, 22–23; Home Missions' work among, 135.
Indigenous Church, report of committee on, 204–205.
Individualism, development of philosophical, 33–35.
Inman, Rev. Samuel Guy, 206.
Institute of Social and Religious Research, 88, 167, 240.
"Institutes," Calvin's, 16.
Interchurch World Movement, 83, 88, 238, 239–240.
Interdenominational co-operation, 106–107; need for, in mission lands, 196 ff.; movement toward, irresistible, 260; unconscious preparation for, 260–262; effect of marriage on, 262; rôle of civic organizations toward, 262–264. *See also* Co-operation.
Interdenominational Evangelistic Association, 254.
International Apostolic Holiness Union, 315.
International Baptist Seminary, 73.
International Daily Vacation Bible School Association, 254.
International Missionary Council, 214–216.
International Sunday School Association, 251–252.
International Sunday School Council of Religious Education, 251–252.
International Sunday School Lessons Committee, 251–252.
Intolerance, growth of, among Protestants, 19.
Iowa, denominations in, 111, 122, 124.
Iowa Synod of the Lutheran Church, 50.
Irving, Edward, 42–43.
Italy, Protestant reform movement in, 7, 11.

Jackson, Sheldon, 247.
Jacob of Joeterbook, 6.
James I, 11, 16.
Jamestown, Episcopal church established at, 20.
Jewel, Bishop, 16.
Jews, problem of the, 289.
Johnson, Rev. Lyman H., 57, 310.
Jones, Abner, 305.
Jones, Dr. E. Stanley, 209.
Joseph II, 8.
Judson, Adoniram, 268.

Kansas, number of denominations in, 111.
Kelly, Dr. Robert L., cited and quoted, 278–279, 280.
Kentucky, denominations in, 112, 122.
King, Samuel, 305
King's Chapel, Boston, 297.

Kiwanis Clubs, 262.
Klebitz, Deacon, fight between Heshusius and, 15.
Kleine Gemeinde Mennonites, the, 25, 303.
Knapp, Rev. Martin W., 315.
Knox, John, cited and quoted, 10, 17, 62.
Korea, policy of territorial delimitation in, 208.
Korteniemi, Solomon, 311.

Lambeth Conference, 232.
Laski, John, 17.
Latin America, Home Missions work in, 136; co-operation in, 206–209.
Latitudinarian type of community church, 172.
Laud, Archbishop, 16, 46, 146.
Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, 236–238, 255.
Leaders, need for religious, 277–278; co-operation in training, 293–294; need of training for, 294–295.
LeFevre, 7.
Leipzig, Colloquy at, 15.
Liberty, development of religious, 33–35, 68–69.
Life and Advent Union sect, 43, 310.
Log College, 71.
London Secretaries Association, 212.
Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, 251.
Lord's Supper, nature and function of, 36–38.
Louis VI, 15.
Louisiana, number of denominations in, 112.
Lovedale, South Africa, union school at, 210.
Lumber Conference, 316.
Luther, Martin, 8, 10, 38, 62; longer and shorter catechisms of, 12; dissension between Zwingli and, 14–15; doctrine of Ubiquity, 16; theory of, concerning Lord's Supper, 36.
Lutheran Church, 11, 28, 42, 66, 114, 122, 123; creeds drawn up by, 12; controversy between Reformed Church and the, 14–15; early American, 21; attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38; theory of baptism held by, 39; Episcopal form of government in, 45; origin of separate synods of, 50; Bible interpretation of the, 57–58; effect of slavery on, 61; area covered by, 114, 120, 122, 123, 124, 130; co-operation in, 221–222.
Lutheran Free Church, 314.
Lutheran sects, 42, 44, 48, 50, 61, 298, 301, 302, 303, 306, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 318.
Lumberjacks, work of Home Missions Council among, 146.
Lyon, Mary, 72.
McAdow, Samuel, 305.
Macaulay, T. Babington, quoted, 16.
McDaniel, Dr. George W., 272.
Madras, Christian College for Women in, 209.
Maine, number of denominations in, 112, 122.
Mapes, James J., 314.
Marcellus of Padua, 5.
Marian Reaction, the, 16, 18.
Mary I (Mary Tudor), 10, 11.
Maryland, early denominationalism in, 21; denominations in, 112, 122.
Massachusetts, early denominationalism in, 21; denominations

in, 112, 122, 130; Roman Catholics in, 130.
Massachusetts Bay Colony, Christian education fostered by, 70.
Maurice, Prince of Orange, 10.
Maximilian II, 8.
Medical Colleges, union, 210.
Melanchthon, Philipp, 16, 62.
Membership. *See* Church Membership.
Menno, Simon, 49.
Mennonite Brethren in Christ, 25, 48, 52, 312.
Mennonite Brethren Church of North America, 302.
Mennonites, the, 11, 59, 66, 299; creeds drawn up by, 13; establishment of, in Colonial America, 21; interpretation of Lord's Supper held by, 38; theory of baptism held by, 40; church polity of, 47; distribution of, 117–118. *See also:* Church of God in Christ; Defenseless Mennonites.
Mennonite sects, 45, 48, 49, 50, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 315, 316.
Meredith College, 72.
Methodist Episcopal Church, 11, 66, 105, 113, 114, 224, 225, 304; establishment of, in America, 22; theory of baptism held by, 40; adherence of, to Arminianism, 41; question of membership in, 44; origin of, 51; effect of slavery on, 59–60; education promoted by, 71, 72, 73; area covered by, 60, 114, 122, 124, 129, 130, 132; co-operation in, 224–225. [*See also:* Congregational Methodists; New Congregational Methodist Church; Methodist Protestant Church.
Methodist Episcopal Church South, 60, 114, 120, 122, 123, 128, 129, 131, 132, 307.
Methodist Protestant Church, polity of, 47, 306.
Methodist sects, 41, 44, 47, 51, 59–60, 301, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311.
Metropolitan Church Association, 52, 120, 314.
Mexico, Home Missions work in, 136; co-operative movements in, 207.
Michigan, denominations in, 111, 122, 123.
Migrant groups, work of Home Missions Council among, 146.
Millenary petition, the, 16.
Miller, William, 43.
Ministers, increase in numbers of, 81; over-supply of, 93–95; salaries of, 95–98; lack of scholastic training among, 98–99; problem of resident, 99–100.
Minnesota, denominations in, 112, 122, 130.
Missionaries, distribution of, 198–199; attitude of, toward co-operation, 205–206.
Missionary Alliance for Foreign Work, 314.
Missionary Church Association, 42, 314.
Missionary conferences, interdenominational, 212.
Missionary Education Movement, 252, 328.
Missionary work, increase in, 71.
Missions, "united" church support of, 185–186. *See* Foreign Missions; Home Missions.
Mississippi, denominations in, 112, 122, 128, 129.
Missouri, denominations in, 111, 122.
Mode, Peter G., quoted, 22–23.

Money, increase in giving, 82.
Montana, number of denominations in, 112; State Home Missions Council in, 154.
Moody, Dwight L., 252–253.
Moore, Thomas E., 311.
Moravia, Protestantism in, 8, 11.
Moravian Church, 21, 48, 300. *See also:* Unitas Fratrum.
More, Sir Thomas, 10.
Mormons. *See* Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Morris, Ira, 309.
Mott, Dr. John R., quoted, 198.
Mountaineers, Home Missions work among, 136.
Mount Holyoke College, 72.
Mozunder, A. K., 318.
Muhlhausen, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Mullins, Dr. E. Y., 272.
Mumford, Stephen, 304.
Murray, John, 22.

Nantes, Edict of, 8.
National Covenant, Scotland's, 10.
National Lutheran Council, 222.
National Spiritualistic Association, 314.
National Women's Christian Temperance Union, 250.
Nebraska, denominations in, 111, 122, 123.
Negroes, Home Missions work among, 136; denominations composed of, 319–321.
Netherlands, rise of Protestantism in the, 9, 11.
Nevada, denominations in, 112, 117; State Home Missions Council in, 154–155.
New Amsterdam, Dutch Reformed Church established at, 21.
New Apostolic Church, 50, 301.
New Congregational Methodist Church, 311.
New Dunkards. *See* Church of God.
New Hampshire, denominations in, 112, 122.
New Haven Colony, Christian education fostered by, 70.
New Jersey, Presbyterian Church in, 21; College of, 71; denominations in, 112, 122, 124.
New Jerusalem. *See* Church of the New Jerusalem.
New Mexico, number of denominations in, 112.
Newport, R. I., division in Baptist church in, 27.
New School Presbyterian denomination, effect of slavery on, 61.
New Testament, vernacular translations of the, 8.
New York State, denominations in, 122, 124, 129, 131.
Nicolas of Clemanges, 6.
Nismes, Edict of, 8.
Non-Sectarian Church of Bible Faith, 56, 310.
Nordin, Robert, 298.
North Carolina, early denominationalism in, 21; denominations in, 112, 122, 128.
North Dakota, denominations in, 112, 122; State Home Missions Council in, 154.
Northern Baptist Convention, 73, 114, 121, 123, 124, 130, 132, 224, 317.
Northwestern University, 71.
Norway, rise of Protestantism in, 9, 12.
Norwegian Anti-Missouri Brotherhood, 303.
Norwegian-Danish Conference, 303.

Norwegian-Danish Free Church, 25, 302.
Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, 25, 221, 303.

Oberholzer, John, 50, 308.
Ochino, Bernadino, 7.
Ohio, denominations in, 111, 122.
Ohio Synod of the Lutheran Church, origin of, 50.
O'Kelly, James, 305.
Oklahoma, denominations in, 112, 122.
Old Amish Mennonite Church, 29, 49.
Old Mennonite Church, 49.
Old Order Brethren, 307.
Old Order German Baptist Brethren, 49, 59, 311. *See also:* Wisler sect; German Baptist Brethren.
Old Order Mennonite Church. *See* Amish Mennonite; Wisler sect.
Olevianus, Kaspar, 15.
Ontario, Ohio, interdenominational co-operation in, 106.
Oregon, denominations in, 112, 124.
Original Freewill Baptists, attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38.
Otterbein, Philip, 29, 52.
Otterbein, William, 305.

Pacific Islands, policy of territorial delimitation in the, 208.
Palmer, Paul, 298, 304.
Panama, co-operative movements in, 207.
Papal power, decline of, 5, 6.
Parker, Daniel, 306.
Particular Baptists, 13, 298; theory of baptism held by, 40.
Patton, George, 308.
Peasants' War, 9.
Pedobaptists, 56.
Peking Union Medical College, 210.
Penial Mission, 52, 316.
Pennsylvania, early denominationalism in, 21; denominations in, 111, 122, 124.
Pentecost Bands of the World, 315.
Pentecostal Church of America, Association of the, 317.
Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, 42, 114, 317.
Pentecostal Holiness Church, 317.
Pepperell type of community church, 172.
Persecution, early sectarian, 18–19; religious, in America, 33.
Peru, co-operative movements in, 207.
Philadelphia Baptist Association, education promoted by, 71.
Philadelphia Plan for organic union, 227–229.
Philanthropy, Home Missions contribution to, 135.
Philip II, 7, 9.
Philippines, policy of territorial delimitation in, 208.
Phinazee, Rev. Hiram, 308.
Pillar of Fire sect, 316.
Pingyang, union junior college at, 210.
Piper, Dr. David R., 172.
Plymouth, Congregational Church established at, 20–21.
Plymouth Brethren, divisions among, 48.
Plymouth Brethren, I, 28, 53, 301.
Plymouth Brethren, II, 24, 301.
Plymouth Brethren, III, 28, 48, 311.
Plymouth Brethren IV, 118, 120, 313.
Plymouth Brethren V, 318.

Plymouth Brethren VI, 316.
Pocket Testament League, 254.
Poland, Protestantism in, 8, 11; creed drawn up in, 13.
Politico-Religious theories, 32–33.
Polity. *See* Church polity.
Porto Rico, Home Missions work in, 136, 146; co-operative movements in, 207–208.
Pre-Millenarianism, 43.
Presbyterian Church, 11, 27, 28, 66, 68, 114, 120, 123, 124, 129, 130, 132, 299, 304; creed drawn up by, 13; internal struggle within, 16; fight between Anglicans and, 17; form of government, 45, 46, 47, 48; variations in polity in sects within, 48; effect of slavery on, 61; education promoted by, 71, 72, 73; area covered by, 114, 122; co-operation in, 155, 222–224; Plan of Union between Congregationalists and, 229–230.
Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, origin of, 61.
Presbyterian Church in the United States, South, 61, 113, 114, 120, 128, 129, 131, 132, 223, 310.
Presbyterian Polytechnic Institute, San German, 147.
Presbyterian sects, 48, 51–52, 56, 61, 304, 305, 306, 309, 310.
Primitive Baptist Church, 42, 50, 59, 306.
Primitive Methodist Church, 24, 44, 51, 301.
Princeton University, 71.
Printing, interdenominational, on foreign field, 208–209.
Program, church, 102–104.
Progressive Dunkards (Dunkers), 50, 312.
Progressive Spiritualistic Church, 317.
Progressivism versus Conservatism, 48–50.
Propaganda, necessity for special, 265–266.
Protestant Episcopal Church, 122, 123; method of persecution practised by, 19; establishment of, at Jamestown, 20; education sponsored by, 71; area covered by, 113, 122, 123, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132; proposals of, toward unity, 232–234; first bishops of, 297.
Protestantism, beginnings of, 4–6; rise of, in Spain, 7, 11; in Italy, 7, 11; in France, 7–8, 11; in Bohemia, 8, 11; in Moravia, 8, 11; in Poland, 8, 11; in Hungary, 8, 11; in Germany, 9, 11; in Switzerland, 9; in Denmark, 9, 12; in Norway, 9, 12; in Sweden, 9, 12; in Belgium, 9; in Holland, 9–10, 11; in Scotland, 10; in England, 10–11; break-up of, into denominationalism, 11–12; growth of bigotry and intolerance among, 19; imported sects of, 20–26; native sects of, 26–28; achievements of, 79–83; denominational distribution among, 132–134.
Providence, R. I., Six-Principle Baptist sect in, 27.
Provoost, Bishop Samuel, 297.
Puritans, the, 15, 16, 17.

Quadrennial Continental Conference, 212.
Quakers, the, 11, 53, 68, 299; statements of belief made by, 14; internal struggle among, 16; persecution of, 19, 33; establishment of, in America, 21;

attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38; theory of baptism held by, 40; church polity of, 47; educational institutions sponsored by, 72.
Questionnaires, 125–132, 161–165, 282–293.

Radio, contribution of, to civic betterment, 264–265.
Randall, Benjamin, 305.
Randolph-Macon System, 72.
Rauschenbusch, Walter, quoted, 275.
Reformation, seeds of the, 4–6; rise of the, 7–11; change in spirit of the, 19.
Reformed Churches, the, 11, 122; creeds drawn up by the, 12–13; controversy between Lutheran Church and the, 14–15; attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38; theory of baptism held by, 39; adherence of, to Calvinism, 42; Presbyterian form of government of, 45, 46; Bible interpretations of, 57, 58; cessation of division in, 66; plan for union of, with Presbyterian Church, 223; resolutions of, toward unity, 234.
Reformed Church in America, 132.
Reformed Church in the United States, 132.
Reformed Church of Holland, 15.
Reformed Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 309.
Reformed Church of North America, 297.
Reformed Church of the United States, 299.
Reformed Episcopal Church, 48, 311.
Reformed Huguenots, 11.
Reformed Mennonite Church, 49, 306.
Reformed Presbyterian Church, 22, 134, 300.
Reformed sects, 11, 13, 15, 22, 48, 49, 134, 297, 299, 300, 301, 306, 309, 311, 317.
Reformed Synod of Czenger, creed drawn up by, 13.
Regular Baptists, 13, 25, 303.
Religion, effect of the Reformation on, 4 ff.
Religious liberty, 33–35.
Religious wars, 8.
Revival of Learning, effect of, on religion, 4.
Revivals, effect of religious, 50–53, 252–253.
Rhenish Missionary Society, 24.
Rhode Island, Baptists in, 21; denominations in, 112, 122.
Rhode Island College, 71.
Richmond University, 72.
River Brethren, 22, 300, 309; theory of baptism held by, 40. *See also:* Brethren in Christ; United Zion Children.
Roberts, B. T., 309.
Rockefeller, John D., Jr., 240.
Rockefeller, John D., Sr., 72.
Roman Catholics, early settlements of, 3; early influence of, 4–6; in Massachusetts, 130; in New England, 289.
Roman Catholic Church, 87, 93; attitude of, against church unity, 235–236; attitude of, toward co-operation, 255.
Root, Elihu, 87.
Rotary Clubs, 262.
Rudolph II, 8, 9.
Rushbrooke, Dr. J. H., quoted, 273.
Rutgers, Henry, 71.
Rutgers College, 71.

St. Bartholomew's Massacre, 8, 18.

Salaries, ministers', 95–98.
Salvation Army, 25, 28, 53, 113, 302; adherence of, to Arminianism, 42.
Santurce, Congregational school at, 147.
San Domingo, evangelization work in, 147.
Savonarola, 6.
Savoy Declarations of Faith and Order, 14.
Saxon Visitation Articles, 41.
Scandinavia, rise of Protestantism in, 9, 12.
Schmalcald, League of, 9.
Schools, denominational, 72–73, 209–211. *See* Education.
Schwenkfeld, Kaspar, 21, 53.
Schwenkfelders, the, 11, 21, 299; interpretation of Lord's Supper held by, 38; theory of baptism held by, 40; distribution of, 118.
Scotland, rise of Protestantism in, 10, 11.
Scott, Orange, 59, 307.
Seabury, Bishop Samuel, 297.
Second Coming, doctrine of the, 42–44.
Second Helvetic Creed, the, 12.
Sectarianism, development of, 12 ff., 36–65; deepening of, by persecution, 18–19; advantages of, 74–79; appeal of, to pride, 268–271.
Sects, creed-making among, 12–14; spirit among early, 14–19; native, in America, 26 ff.; European influence on native, 28–29; effect of foreign language on formation of, 29; state distribution of, 111–117; growth of small, 118–121; state preferences for, 121–125. *See also:* Denominations.
Selwyn, Bishop, quoted, 202.
Seminaries, training furnished by, 278–282; undenominational, 282.
Seoul, Korea, Union College at, 210.
Separate Baptist Church, 51, 304.
Separatists, internal struggle among, 15–16.
Seven Articles of Faith (Anabaptists), 13.
Seventh Day, adherence to the, 42.
Seventh-Day Adventists, 42, 43, 113, 307.
Seventh-Day Baptist denomination, 27, 42, 120, 304.
Shakers, the, 22. *See* United Society of Believers.
Shanghai, Union College at, 210.
Shite, Bishop William, 297.
Sigismund I, 8.
Sigismund, Augustus, 8.
Simpson, Rev. A. B., 314.
Six-Principle Baptist sect, 27, 59, 303.
Slavery, effect of, on denominationalism, 59–61.
Smith, Gypsy, 253.
Smith, Joseph, 63.
Smith, Joseph, Jr., 64, 309.
Smith College, 72, 209.
Social Brethren Church, 310.
Social organizations, 103.
Society of Believers, 22.
Socinians, the, 11.
Somerset, Duke of, 16.
Somerset Statements of Beliefs, 14.
Soule, Bishop, 307.
South Carolina, denominations in, 112, 122.
South Dakota, denominations in, 112, 122.
Southern Baptist Convention, 61, 114, 121, 122, 123, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 307.
South India Church, 211.

Spain, Protestant reform movement in, 7, 11.
Spanish-speaking people, Home Missions work among the, 147.
Spires, Diet of, 9.
Spiritualists, 314, 317.
State Home Missions Councils, 152–155.
"Statement of Beliefs" (Baptist), 13.
States, denominational distribution in, 111–118; sect preference in, 121–125.
Statistics, Federal Census, 79–82.
Stauffer, Jacob, 307.
Stauffer Mennonites, 307.
Stearns, Shuball, 304.
Stone, B. W., 55, 305.
Strauss, Samuel, quoted, 77.
Strawbridge, Robert, 304.
Strong, Dr. Augustus, 272.
Sunday, Rev. William A., 253.
Sunday schools, 102, 103.
Sunderland, Le Roy, 307.
Suomi Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America, 313.
Swabians, Articles of Faith drawn up by, 13.
Sweden, rise of Protestantism in, 9, 12.
Swedenborg, Emanuel, 54.
Swedish Evangelical Free Missions, 312.
Swedish Evangelical Missionary Covenant of America, 52, 312.
Swiss, creeds drawn up by the, 13.
Switzerland, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Synodical Conference of Lutherans, 114.
Synod of Dort, 15.

Taborites, the, 11.
Targan, League of, 9.
Taylor, Jeremy, 46.
Temple Society, 44.
Tennant, William, 51, 71.
Tennessee, denominations in, 112, 122.
Territorial delimitation, policy of, 208–209.
Tetrapolitan Confession, the, 15.
Texas, denominations in, 112, 122; interdenominational co-operation in, 155.
Theological seminaries, interdenominational, on foreign field, 210–211.
Theology, discussions of, 16.
Thirty-Nine Articles, the, 13.
Thomas, John, M. D., 44, 308.
Toleration Edict of Joseph II, 8.
Town and Country church problem, 156–160, 182–190.
Transcendental Way, Church of the, 318.
Transubstantiation, Luther's doctrine of, 18.
Trinity Church, New York City, 71.
Trinity College, 72.
Twelve Articles of Faith for Protestants (Hungary), 13.
Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists, 306; adherence of, to Calvinism, 42.

Ubiquity, Luther's doctrine of, 16.
Union, plans for organic, 227–238.
Union of Utrecht, 10.
Union Theological Seminary, Mexico City, 146.
Unitarian Church, 27, 305; attitude of, toward Lord's Supper, 38.
Unitas Fratrum, 8, 11, 21, 300. *See* Moravian Church; United Brethren in Christ.

United Baptist Church, 27, 224, 304.
United Brethren in Christ, 11, 21, 29, 49, 305; adherence of, to Arminianism, 41; origin of, 52; state distribution of, 124, 132; proposed plan of union between Evangelical Church and, 231–232.
"United" churches. *See* Community church.
United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 315.
United Evangelical Synod of North America, 300.
United Lutheran Church in America, 86, 113, 121, 221, 318.
United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, adherence of, to Arminianism, 42, 303.
United Presbyterian Church of North America, 48, 132, 222, 309.
United Society of Believers, 300.
United Society of Christian Endeavor, 254.
U. S. Church (Texas), 155.
U. S. A. Church (Texas), 155.
United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (South), origin of, 61.
United Zion Children, 59, 309.
Unity, search for Church, 54–57; development of, 166 ff.
Unity and co-operation, undenominational organizations that work for, 244–259.
Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, 244.
Universalist Church, 300; establishment of, 22; proposed plan of union between Congregationalists and, 230–231.
University of Chengtu, 209.
University of Chicago, 72.
University of Richmond, 72.
Ursinus, 15.
Usher, James, 46.
Utah, denominations in, 112, 122.
Utrecht, Union of, 10.

Vergerius, Peter Paul, 7.
Vermont, denominations in, 112, 123.
Vincent, Bishop Boyd, quoted, 266.
Virginia, denominations in, 112, 123, 128.
Volunteers of America, 53, 314.

Wake, William, 46.
Wake Forest College, 72.
Waldensians, the, 7, 11.
Wallace, Rev. Hardin, 315.
Walsh, J. P., 310.
Washington, denominations in, 112, 123; State Home Missions Council in, 155.
Wayland, Dr., 60.
Wesley, John, 22.
Wesleyan Methodist Church, 59, 307.
Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 51.
Wessel, John, 6.
Westeras, Diet of, 9.
Westminster Confession of Faith, 13.
West Virginia, denominations in, 112, 123.
White, Mrs. Alma, 316.
White, Mrs. Ellen G., 307.
White, James, 307.
Whitefield, George, 51.
Whitlock, Rev. Eleazer, 72.
Wickenden, William, 298, 303.
Wilbur, John, 308.
Wilburites, 308.
William of Orange, 10.
Williams, Roger, 298.

Winebrennerians, the, 56, 57, 59, 306.
Winebrenner, John, 306.
Wisconsin, denominations in, 111, 123.
Wisler, Jacob, 310.
Wisler sect, 49, 310.
Wisler Mennonites, the, 29.
Women's Board of Foreign Missions, 214.
Women's Christian Temperance Union, 250.
Women's National Sabbath Alliance, 254.
World Conference on Faith and Order, 232, 234, 236–238.
World Women's Christian Union, 250.
Wright, Bishop Milton, 313.
Wyclif, John, 6.
Wyoming, number of denominations in, 112; State Home Missions Council in, 155.

Yale University, 70.
York River Brethren, 49, 307.
Young, Brigham, 64, 307.
Young Men's Christian Association, 248–250.
Young people, neglect of, 103–104.
Young Women's Christian Association, 248–249.

Zurich, rise of Protestantism in, 9.
Zwickau prophets, 9.
Zwingli, 9, 14, 36, 38, 62; dissension between Luther and, 14–15; theory of, concerning Lord's Supper, 36–37.
Zwinglian Reformed Church, the, 11.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
10084

10084

BR
515
B45

Bass, Archer Bryan.

Protestantism in the United States, by Archer B. Bass ... New York, Thomas Y. Crowell company [c1929]

xii, 364 p. 22cm.

Bibliography: p. 323-326.

1. Protestantism. 2. Protestant churches—U. S. 3. Christian union. I. Title.

BR515.B45 29—4599

Library of Congress [53o½] CCSC/sr

10084